

an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide a method for nominating and electing Judges of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 18904. A bill for the relief of Gilda and Arturo Canestraro and minor children, Sandro and Mirena Canestraro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18905. A bill for the relief of Leonardo Di Giovanna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 18906. A bill for the relief of Giana Antonietta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18907. A bill for the relief of Rosalie Alcantara Belen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18908. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Biradelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18909. A bill for the relief of Tetsuko Hori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18910. A bill for the relief of Edward Victor Howard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18911. A bill for the relief of Hyun Oak Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18912. A bill for the relief of Tuen Kwok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18913. A bill for the relief of Yolanda Alamares Malasmas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18914. A bill for the relief of Estela Villarojo Maracha (also known as Estela

E. Villarojo); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18915. A bill for the relief of Roberta Figueroa Mercado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18916. A bill for the relief of Bartolome M. Moreto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18917. A bill for the relief of Jose Aquino Ruperto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18918. A bill for the relief of Cecelia Hsiao-Teh Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18919. A bill for the relief of Kiyoko Yoshizawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 18920. A bill for the relief of Kan Tat King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 18921. A bill for the relief of Nicola Di Lorenzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 18922. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in certain lands located in the State of Florida to the record owner or owners of such lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 18923. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Giovanni Bagnato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 18924. A bill for the relief of Margrethe Kristensen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 18925. A bill for the relief of Dr. Nieva Gorospe Valle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 18926. A bill for the relief of Humberto

A. Revollo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 18927. A bill for the relief of Yung Hoo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18928. A bill for the relief of Aldora Maria Moreira Ramos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 18929. A bill for the relief of Simplicio Velasco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 18930. A bill to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Pfc. Joseph Anthony Snitko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 18931. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Christian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 18932. A bill for the relief of Arshalouys Kevork Boyadjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 18933. A bill for the relief of Atanasio Perez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 18934. A bill for the relief of Antonino Calamina, his wife, Antonina Calamina, and their minor daughter, Claudia Calamina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

383. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Rochester Police Locust Club, Inc., and the Lake City Police Club, of Oswego, N.Y., relative to denying any citizen the right of free speech, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CULVER PROPOSES LEGISLATION TO REDUCE AIR FARES FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation—H.R. 18800—which would provide reduced air fares for older citizens on a standby basis, similar to the special fares already available for young people and military personnel.

In an age of rapid air travel, many of our senior citizens are caught in a cruel dilemma. On the one hand, they have more time than any other group to visit their friends, relatives and, in particular, their children and grandchildren. Yet many are unable to do so because of high travel costs and their own fixed low incomes.

At least half of the 4.7 million older people living alone or with nonrelatives had 1965 incomes of less than \$1,348 a year, and are faced with serious financial difficulties that require careful budgeting of essential items. Reduced air fares would therefore open up the opportunity to travel to a large number of this segment of our population.

The measure would benefit the air carriers as well, since the bill authorizes

fare reductions on a standby basis. Thus, the majority of fare cuts would be made on nonpeak flights, and otherwise empty seats will be filled.

In addition, the bill I have introduced will insure that reduced fares are continued for youth, students, and military personnel. At the present time, the Civil Aeronautics Board permits air carriers to experiment with various reduced fare programs, even though the Federal Aviation Act has no specific provisions authorizing such fares. The question has thus been posed as to whether these lower fares are legal, and my proposal would resolve that question by specifically writing the necessary authorization into the law.

Mr. Speaker, in the past 4 years the Congress has demonstrated its commitment to the objective of providing for our senior citizens, who have contributed so much to their communities and their Nation over the years, security and self-respect during their retirement. We have enacted the medicare program, increased social security benefits and liberalized requirements, and established an Administration for the Aging within the Federal Government.

I urge the House of Representatives to follow through on that commitment again, and to enact this legislation to help alleviate the enforced immobility and the consequent isolation and loneliness of many of our older citizens.

DRUG ADDICTION

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the problem of drug addiction is of national concern, as evidenced by the distribution of an educational booklet entitled "Drugs and People" to all 50 States. The booklet, published by the Pennsylvania Health Council, 105 North Front Street, Harrisburg, Pa. 17101, is described by an article recently published in the Patriot, of Harrisburg, Pa. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

COUNCIL ON HEALTH DISTRIBUTING BOOK ABOUT DRUG ABUSE

An illustrated booklet "Drugs and People," designed to educate people on the dangers of drug usage, is being distributed by the Pennsylvania Health Council.

Mrs. Catherine B. Bauer, PHC president, said copies of the booklet have been sent to all 50 states through their health departments and educational bureaus with the information that they may order them from the Pennsylvania organization.

The booklet was prepared and published in Toronto, Ont., by the Alcoholism and Drug Addiction Research Foundation. Its success was immediate in Canada and the health

council realizing its educational value as an informative piece for people of all ages, secured sole rights for publication in the United States.

Speaking for the health council, Mrs. Bauer said:

"For a number of years we have been most interested in helping member groups to recruit people interested in a career in the health field. While we are still interested in this vital function, we realize that we have other pressure problems, such as public health education, and to this end have obtained publishing and distributing rights to the booklet dedicated to the facts about drug abuse."

The booklet is a 31-page publication which illustrates the effects of various drugs and their role in history. It includes illustrations on the use of alcohol, tobacco, cocaine, heroin, LSD, and other drugs.

"I do not feel that we are a sick society as so many people say today," Mrs. Bauer said. "If through our efforts we can get this book into the hands of many elementary and high school students and thereby inform them and their parents of the dangers of drug abuse, I feel that we will have helped in the overall solution to this current and serious problem."

"The understanding of drug abuse certainly is a large step forward to its control."

The council is a nonprofit group of individuals, organizations and institutions interested in health.

POPE PAUL VI APPOINTS RT. REV. MSGR. FRANCIS J. MUGAVERO AS BISHOP OF BROOKLYN

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1968

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the diocese of Brooklyn has a new bishop-designate, with the announcement that Archbishop Bryan J. McEntegart has resigned, due to ill health and advancing years. To Bishop McEntegart, I wish to express my tribute for his years of dedicated service to God, the community, and the people.

The news of his retirement was accompanied by the announcement of the elevation of the Right Reverend Monsignor Francis J. Mugavero to the post of bishop of Brooklyn. I extend to him my prayers and best wishes that he may continue to have the courage, stamina, and spirit of brotherly love necessary to meet the far-reaching challenges of the church in these changing times.

Bishop-designate Mugavero is the first native of Brooklyn to be elevated to head the largest diocese in the country. Mr. Speaker, in order that my colleagues might become a little more familiar with the background and personal attributes of the new bishop who will be consecrated on September 12, I would like to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Frank DeRosa from the Tablet of July 18, 1968, entitled, "He Accomplishes Much Sans Noise":

HE ACCOMPLISHES MUCH SANS NOISE
(By Frank DeRosa)

The things high school yearbook editors say about their classmates don't always stand the test of time. Here is what the "Gargoyle" of Cathedral Prep said in 1934 of Francis J. Mugavero:

"He has the rare faculty of accomplishing much, sans noise and turmoil. Mild in de-

meanor and ever unassuming, his affable nature has secured for him the affectionate regard of all."

Thirty-four years later, the reaction of the people of the Diocese to the announcement of Msgr. Mugavero as their bishop-elect reflects the long-range perception of the "Gargoyle's" observations.

Priests and laity who have worked with Msgr. Mugavero speak of him in superlatives, a rare occurrence in an era of dissent. They stress his kindness, friendliness, diplomacy and warmth.

Father Arthur W. Pote, who resided with Msgr. Mugavero at St. Vincent de Paul Rectory in Brooklyn, said he is "terribly interested in serving the people."

"He was influenced by two great men," he said, "Msgr. Ottavio Silvestri at St. Joseph Patron and Msgr. Leopold Arcese at Nativity."

"Both priests stressed the importance of serving the people—'serve, serve, serve' Msgr. Silvestri would almost shout to his curates—and their example helped him form his approach to the priestly ministry."

HIS FATHER WAS A BARBER

Bishop-elect Mugavero was born in Brooklyn, June 8, 1914, one of six children of Italian immigrants Angelo and Rose Pernice Mugavero. They lived in an apartment in a building at 617 DeKalb Ave. which also housed Angelo's barbershop.

He studied under the Sisters of St. Joseph at St. Ambrose School and was an altar boy for a young priest named Father Joseph Wiesl, who later was archpriest at his first Mass.

Describing some of his activities at the prep seminary, the "Gargoyle" said: "He has found time to be one of the 'Gargoyle's' mainstays, a zealous member of the Achille Ratti Society, an ad-getter extraordinaire, and a French linguist, to mention but a few."

From Cathedral he went on to Immaculate Conception Seminary in Huntington.

Ordained May 18, 1940, he was assigned to St. Joseph Patron parish on Suydam St., where he led the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine and Sodality. Sixteen months later he was transferred to Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary in Ozone Park.

While he was at Nativity, Father Mugavero began graduate studies at Fordham's School of Social Service. He later earned a master's degree.

In addition to following a heavy academic schedule, Father Mugavero headed two units of the Third Order of St. Francis at Nativity, conducted the CCD, guided the altar boys and took part in a parish building drive.

In 1944, he began a long and distinguished career in social welfare when he was named director of the Ferrini Welfare League and associate director of Queens Catholic Charities.

Recalling Msgr. Mugavero's days with the league, one of his associates said: "He was a superb counsellor. He communicated with the people and the people went crazy over him."

Four years after joining Catholic Charities in Queens he became the county director and in 1961 Archbishop McEntegart named him his secretary for Charities.

As secretary for Charities, Msgr. Mugavero directed one of the largest private welfare operations in the country.

In its report for 1967, Charities revealed that it had spent \$44 million for health and welfare programs that served more than 350,000 people.

Both of Msgr. Mugavero's parents and a brother Michael are deceased. A brother Joseph lives in Rego Park. Two sisters live in Manhattan's Stuyvesant Town: Marie and Josephine (Mrs. George) Kramer, and one in Massapequa, Rose (Mrs. George) Wynn.

One of the bishop-elect's ten nieces and nephews is Josephine's son Donald, now Brother Berard, a Franciscan novice at Upper Brookville, L.I.

For the last 22 years, Msgr. Mugavero has resided at St. Vincent de Paul rectory in Brooklyn where he has become a close friend of dozens of priests who lived there with him.

They know him as a "Confessor par excellence," as one said. They know him for his sense of humor. They know the pride he has in the men who were ordained with him 28 years ago.

And now they know him as the most illustrious member of his cherished "famous class of '40."

CRIME GAMESHIP

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent review which appeared in today's issue of the Washington Post. In an analysis of "The Crime War," by Robert M. Cipes, the Washington attorney and author, Ronald L. Goldfarb, gets at the core of perhaps the most urgent domestic issue facing this Nation—the need to find "a fresh and sensible approach to the endless and evolving problems of crime and law enforcement." The review is a commentary on our seeming inability, in spite of all the declarations of war against crime, to cope effectively with these problems. Mr. Goldfarb points out the danger of looking for simple solutions, and he deplores the emphasis on finding a scapegoat, which prevents a realistic assessment of how best to deal with crime. I would like to place this review in the RECORD at this time:

CRIME GAMESMANSHIP

(By Ronald L. Goldfarb, Washington attorney and author)

(Book Review: "The Crime War," By Robert M. Cipes (New American Library, 190 pp., \$5.50).)

Crime is the hot domestic issue. "Law and Order" is on the six-cent stamp and the campaign trails. And beyond our periodic crime commission reports, FBI statistics annually lamenting rising crime rates, seasonal declarations of war on organized crime and continuous attacks on the Supreme Court for "coddling criminals" at the expense of public safety, the country lately has been made grimly aware of the deep and brooding sickness of crime by dramatic episodes of riot, assassination, violence and civil disobedience.

While there is a special need to rise above platitudes and myths and knee-jerk reactions in facing the present crime problem, there is little evidence that partisans in the cops-and-robbers debate are prepared to replace rhetoric with reason.

Instead, the hunt is on for scapegoats. Conservatives want us to forsake permissiveness and bleeding-heart leniency by the courts and get tough. Yet scientists tell us that sex crimes are not related to dirty books or movies; the U.S. Attorney General, our chief prosecutor, advises that court decisions can no more cure crime than aspirin can cure cancer, and studies by academicians and law enforcement officials have shown that purportedly crippling constitutional procedures have not cut down police efficiency, confessions or conviction rates.

Meanwhile, liberals pooh-pooh crime statistics, blame everything on poverty and preju-

dice and denounce the police, while city dwellers are terrorized and fleeing urban life; rioters and demonstrators are making rapprochement almost impossible, even with those in sympathy with them, and the police are given extraordinary social tasks without the corresponding training, salary or sympathies required. How can this lead to the realistic, balanced, principled law enforcement system so desperately needed in a free society?

This book does not help the quandary along. Cipres is a good writer and a knowledgeable criminal lawyer. His book synthesizes some of the recent literature of crime in a breezy fashion which will interest the uninformed person who has chosen sides and needs ammunition. But the book does no more than quickly put its author in the liberal camp and then pick away at the standard targets: J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI, the late Robert Kennedy's drive to convict Jimmy Hoffa, headline hunting DAs and conviction-happy cops, the bleakness of the world of the lower criminal courts, the high political stake in attacking racketeering and the senselessness of our penal institutions. That he may be right in his judgments and his condemnations of excess does not improve matters. Cipres knows better than to serve up clichés—"In a world of often unbearable complexity and uncertainty, the thirst for simple solutions is enormous"—yet he concludes, "America's problem is not really crime, though it may yet become that. The problems are race and poverty."

We are going to have to do better than this. We can agree, for instance, that prisons breed crime and still be concerned with rising recidivism rates and the absence of a workable alternative for rehabilitation. We can't put criminals out of a bad system until we devise a better one. We can agree with those who have pointed out the inadequacy of crime statistics and still be properly concerned with the amount of crime—detected and undetected. We may be offended by convictions based on the testimony of criminals and undesirables and by the use of privacy-invasive devices, while remaining honestly perplexed about how to prove a white slavery case without the testimony of a prostitute, how to disassemble a vast underworld empire without the use of undercover agents or how to prove a national telephone-based bookmaking operation without using wiretaps or eavesdropping.

The point is that in a very real and existential sense there is a crime problem and we are going to have to cope with it in a more satisfactory way. The first step may well be to stop treating it as a "war" between liberal and conservative ideologues. It does no good to argue (as many liberals do) that crime is a matter of symptoms and we should be dealing with diseases; the patient cannot be left to suffer or die because we failed to treat the symptoms. Nor is it any use to witchdoctor the problem (as many conservatives do) by exorcising devils invented to prove the sickness. If we are to control the crime problem so that our society may become more viable, amenable and sociable, we are going to have to drop the gamesmanship which this book typifies and get at it. The "good guys" and the "bad guys" approach, always simplistic, is now downright dangerous.

Needed are scientific assessments of traditional problems, better measurements of the effectiveness of our programs and our policies, better people in the business, the refinement of our priorities. Our criminal laws, sentencing practices, penal institutions and moral commitments need re-evaluation. Toward these ends, all political camps need to drop the jargon and the false, quick formulas and seek a fresh and sensible approach to the endless and evolving problems of crime and law enforcement.

FIELD MARSHAL MONTGOMERY'S COMMENTS ON VIETNAM

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1968

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, Field Marshal Viscount Montgomery of Alamein, the British hero of the desert campaign of the Second World War and a man well versed in modern warfare, recently gave an interview to the New York Times regarding America's policy in Vietnam.

I hope my colleagues will consider the views of this distinguished statesman and warrior. The article from the New York Times of July 3, 1968, follows:

MONTGOMERY CALLS ON THE UNITED STATES TO WRITE OFF THE WAR IN VIETNAM

LONDON, July 2.—At the age of 80, Field Marshal Viscount Montgomery of Alamein is still a man of strong opinions and pungent language.

In a recent interview, the famed commander expressed his views on a wide variety of world issues. He eschewed politics, but he was willing to talk on matters touching his profession of arms, including Vietnam.

Lord Montgomery believes that the United States should write off the war and accept the idea of a Communist-controlled government there.

"You have got to stop this war," he said. "You can't win. What is the point of all these casualties?"

As a first step, Lord Montgomery said, he would stop the bombing of North Vietnam. Then he would try to get the leaders of North and South Vietnam together for talks—but without illusions about the possible results.

ONE GOVERNMENT FORESEEN

"You have got to realize that there will be in the whole of Vietnam one government which will be Communist-controlled," he said. "I don't think it matters. You [the United States], would have to accept it."

The Field Marshal was asked how he would deal with the military advice, repeatedly given to President Johnson, that a complete bombing halt without a reciprocal gesture from Hanoi would increase American casualties.

"The generals must do as they are told," he replied. "The higher conduct of war has got to be in political hands. Once war gets in the hands of generals, you are done."

"They are not winning and they can't win on the battlefield. They have lost the damn war already."

The hero of El Alamein, who became a great popular military figure during and after the war, is still distinguished by that familiar clipped speech and deep-set blue eyes.

It was at El Alamein, in the northern Egyptian desert, that the British stopped Field Marshal Erwin Rommel's eastward advance and then, in October, 1942, launched the great counterattack that routed the Axis forces and ended the threat to Alexandria, 65 miles away, and the Suez Canal.

The interview with Lord Montgomery took place in his beautiful old house, Isington Mill, near Alton in Hampshire, in the country about 50 miles from London. Spotted about the room were signed photographs of the great—General Eisenhower, Marshal Tito, Queen Elizabeth II, Winston Churchill.

Lord Montgomery set his views on Vietnam in the framework of a general theory about the Far East. This was that "in the long run"—after 20 or 25 years—Communist China would inevitably dominate mainland Asia.

"America can't stop it," he said. "Nor can anybody else. All the nations from Burma

right round to Korea will look to Peking as they used to in the old days."

Lord Montgomery visited Communist China in 1961, met Chairman Mao Tse-tung and was feted by the Government. After a tour he said that "the whole population is solidly united," and he praised "the tremendous accomplishments of the past 12 years under Mao Tse-tung."

Lord Montgomery was critical of the United States position in Vietnam in part because, as he saw it, the war did not fit into any political strategy that took account of Asian realities.

RULES OF WAR CITED

"The United States has broken the second rule of war," he said. "That is: don't go fighting with your land army on the mainland in Asia. Rule one is, don't march on Moscow. I developed those two rules myself."

"You are learning now how important this second rule of war is. It is very difficult for a great nation which has made a mistake to come out."

"But you aren't the policemen of the world, you Americans, are you?"

Another reason given by Lord Montgomery for his criticism of the Vietnam war was its effect on the United States' reputation.

"The whole of world opinion is against you on this issue," he said. "You are becoming a very unpopular nation, which I think is a tragedy."

"If you think of what your nation did after the war to help the nations recover, the generosity of the United States was unprecedented. And now you are becoming one of the most hated people in the world."

Lord Montgomery was asked how he would deal with the evident concern of other non-Communist Asian nations, such as Thailand, that an American withdrawal from Vietnam would endanger their status.

The United States should continue its alliances in Asia, he answered, and the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization should go on. But, he said, the United States must not commit land forces to the mainland and instead should emphasize naval supremacy.

"The Western world must make quite certain that it has complete domination of the oceans," he asserted.

Lord Montgomery insisted that Chinese domination of the Asian land mass was inevitable. He said this would happen "not by military conquest but by ideological and economic pressure."

He said the countries bordering China—but he excepted India—"will all go." By that he meant, he added, that they would look to Peking for leadership and would be ideologically tuned to Asian Communism.

"Half the people in the world today are Communists," he went on. "That is a fact, and another fact to understand is that the Communism in that part of the world [Asia] is not the Communism of Marx and Lenin."

"It is a new brand which they like and it suits them. If they want to be a Communist and don't push it on us, let them. I don't think anything can prevent that."

CURRENT ISSUES IN THE REGULATION OF MOTOR VEHICLE SIZES AND WEIGHTS

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1968

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, recently our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOORHEAD], brought to our attention the first chapter of a seven-chapter doctoral dissertation entitled, "Current Issues in

the Regulation of Motor Vehicle Sizes and Weights," researched by John W. Fuller III, Ph. D.

Dr. Fuller concludes:

The very great excess of public and social costs over the private benefits discovered by this thesis suggests that any general motor vehicle size and weight increase at this time would be a grave mistake in public economic policy. The recent proposals for size and weight increases at the Federal level, and the numerous proposals at the state level that appear continuously, do not appear economically justifiable. Passage of a bill such as S. 2658 could result in a serious drain on U.S. resources. These economic resources could be used to far greater advantages elsewhere in the economy.

I might point out that Dr. Fuller spent the summers of 1966 and 1967 with the Western Highway Institute, an arm of the American Trucking Association in the West. As a transport economist, he performed economic research involving the transportation characteristics of several important western industries, notably lumber and wood products, livestock, grain, fruits and vegetables, and the nature of intermodal transport competition for the products of these industries.

The Western Highway Institute has published two of his works, "Transportation in the Western Livestock Industry," March 1967, and "Transportation in the Western Forest Products Industry," August 1967.

I call my colleagues' attention to the second chapter of Dr. Fuller's dissertation:

CHAPTER II. THE CURRENT STATUS OF SIZE AND WEIGHT REGULATION

This chapter will describe the present state and Federal legislative standards concerning

sizes and weights under which motor vehicles may operate in the United States. It will also introduce and evaluate the factors which are influencing the demand by various segments of the transportation industry for revised size and weight standards. First, however, it is important to place in perspective the significance of size and weight standards to motor carriers and to the flow of traffic in general. How many motor vehicles are affected by maximum vehicle standards? What portion of the nation's freight and passenger traffic do they carry?

Motor vehicles affected by maximum size and weight limitations

Most motor vehicles operated on United States highways are in no way limited by current vehicle standards. As Table 1 illustrates, only 16 percent of all motor vehicles registered in 1965 were trucks. Only 0.3 percent of all registrations were by buses. The number of very large and very heavy vehicles is even smaller than these figures would indicate because the great majority of trucks is composed of pick-ups used mainly for farm work and personal transportation and small intracity delivery vehicles. The majority of buses consists of smaller school buses. Only the very largest vehicles in use approach the size and weight limit maxima.

TABLE 1.—STATE MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATIONS, 1965¹

Vehicle type	Number registered	Percent of registrations
Automobiles.....	75,260,847	82.026
Buses.....	314,284	.342
(Diesel commercial buses).....	(61,159)	(.066)
Motorcycles.....	1,381,956	1.506
Trucks.....	14,795,051	16.125
(Tractor-trucks).....	(736,302)	(.802)
Total, motor vehicles.....	91,752,138	100.000

¹ Source: U.S., Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Bureau of Public Roads, Highway Statistics, 1965 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, April 1967), pp. 33, 35c.

An approximation to the number of vehicles currently near maximum dimensions and weights can be obtained by adding the number of truck-tractors and the number of diesel commercial buses. The addition yields 797,461 vehicles for 1965, or 0.87 percent of total registrations. That number is only roughly indicative because a few gasoline-powered buses approach maximum size and weight limits, just as do most of the diesel buses, and some single-unit vehicles¹ (such as cement trucks) approach legal limits in certain particulars, just as do truck-tractor combinations. Therefore, 1 percent of all registered vehicles would appear to be a reasonable estimate of the percentage of motor vehicles in the highest size and weight categories. The 1-percent estimate may be too high a figure because many diesel-powered buses are in intracity operation and limited in size more by city street configurations or maneuverability requirements than by size and weight laws. In addition, the greater proportion of truck combinations is composed of small 3- and 4-axle truck-tractor semitrailers and only about one-third of all single-unit trucks are larger than pick-up size.² Clearly, then, only a small percentage of presently operated motor vehicles approaches the maximum allowable size and weight standards; only operators who now have a need for vehicles at or near the maximum presently allowable limits are likely to utilize increased standards.

However, the number of vehicles now present in size and weight categories close to the maximum allowances is only one indicator of the number of vehicles which might utilize increased standards, and is an inadequate indicator of the economic effect revised standards would have on highway transportation. Larger vehicles are likely to be operated more intensively than smaller vehicles. They perform different tasks, and the larger vehicle represents a greater investment of the transport firm's funds.

TABLE 2.—ESTIMATED MILES OF MOTOR VEHICLE TRAVEL IN THE UNITED STATES, BY VEHICLE CATEGORY AND ROAD TYPE, AND COMMERCIAL BUS AND COMBINATION TRAVEL AS A PERCENT OF TOTAL TRAVEL, 1963 AND 1965¹

Road type and year	Travel, by vehicle category (million vehicle-miles)						Total travel	Bus and combination travel (percent of total travel)
	Commercial buses	All passenger vehicles	Single-unit trucks	Truck-tractor combinations	All cargo vehicles	Total, bus and combination		
Main rural roads:								
1963.....	877	232,817	50,043	19,900	69,943	20,777	302,760	6.86
1965.....	922	256,584	56,832	21,994	78,826	22,916	335,410	6.83
All rural roads:								
1963.....	1,047	322,775	76,024	21,202	97,226	22,249	420,001	5.30
1965.....	1,106	355,188	85,210	23,389	108,599	24,495	463,787	5.28
Urban streets:								
1963.....	1,794	327,079	49,729	8,614	58,343	10,408	385,422	2.70
1965.....	1,815	358,796	55,949	9,108	65,057	10,923	423,853	2.58
All roads:								
1963.....	2,841	649,854	125,753	29,816	155,569	32,657	805,423	4.05
1965.....	2,921	713,984	141,159	32,497	173,656	35,418	887,640	3.99

¹ Source: U.S., Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Bureau of Public Roads, "Highway Statistics, 1965" (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, April 1967), p. 54.

The larger vehicle used intensively (usually in line-haul service), with high yearly mileage, has a short working life and is depreciated rapidly. Thus, as shown by Table 2, commercial buses and all truck-tractor combinations, which represent approximately 1 percent of the total number of vehicles in use, produce about 4 percent of the total vehicle-miles of travel in the U. S. Their travel is relatively the greatest on main rural roads and relatively the least on urban streets.

An even better indication of the importance of vehicles likely to be affected by increased maximum size and weight standards is provided by the ton-miles and passenger-miles of output produced by vehicles in the higher size and weight categories. The cargo ton-mile, defined as cargo weight times distance, and the passenger-mile, defined as number of passengers times distance, are the best physical measures of carrier output. According to the Bureau of Public Roads,

only about 30 percent of all freight ton-miles hauled on main rural roads in 1961 moved by single-unit truck. The remainder was carried on truck-tractor combinations and, in comparison with 1951 figures, increasingly moved via the larger combinations which operate closest to maximum size and weight limitations. The very largest and heaviest 5-or-more-axle truck-tractor units carried approximately 27 percent of the intercity ton-miles hauled on main rural roads in 1961.³ Considering the entire Federal-aid system, the very largest and heaviest vehicles transported perhaps 15 percent of the total motor-vehicle freight ton-miles of traffic in 1964.⁴ While bus registrations make up less than 0.4 percent of all registrations, the passenger-miles of commercial bus travel equaled 2.75 percent of all motor vehicle passenger-miles traveled in 1965.⁵ Thus, the percent share in cargo ton-miles of freight and passenger-miles of travel produced by the largest and heaviest vehicles overshadows their numbers.

Far greater importance should be attributed to the role of larger and heavier vehicles in motor transport than is indicated by their numbers or vehicle-miles of travel.

Placed in the larger perspective of total intercity ton-miles and total intercity passenger-miles of travel by all modes however, the economic role of the larger and heavier vehicles is reduced. According to Table 3, the motor vehicle share of intercity freight traffic has remained quite constant during the 1960's at about 22 percent of the total. Applying the 15-percent figure derived above for the percentage of total intercity motor-freight traffic borne by the 5-or-more-axle truck-tractor combinations, slightly over 3 percent of the total volume of intercity freight carried by all modes might be transported by the very largest and heaviest vehicles, those most likely to be affected by revised size and weight allowances.⁶

Footnotes at end of article.

TABLE 3.—VOLUME OF INTERCITY FREIGHT TRAFFIC, PUBLIC AND PRIVATE, BY TRANSPORT AGENCY, 1960-66, SELECTED YEARS¹

Year	Railroad	Motor vehicles	Inland water-ways (including Great Lakes)	Pipelines (oil)	Airways	Total
Millions of ton-miles						
1960.....	579,130	285,483	220,253	228,626	778	1,314,270
1962.....	599,977	209,407	223,089	237,723	1,289	1,371,485
1964.....	666,207	356,298	250,165	268,655	1,504	1,542,829
1965.....	780,700	359,218	262,421	306,393	1,910	1,638,642
1966.....	750,762	380,917	265,000	332,916	2,252	1,831,847
Percentages of annual total						
1960.....	44.06	21.72	16.76	17.40	0.06	100
1962.....	43.75	22.56	16.27	17.33	.09	100
1964.....	43.18	23.09	16.21	17.41	.10	100
1965.....	43.25	21.92	16.01	18.70	.12	100
1966.....	43.35	21.99	15.30	19.22	.13	100

¹ Source: U.S. Interstate Commerce Commission, Bureau of Economics, Transport Economics Monthly Comment (November-December, 1967), p. 5.

Intercity buses, according to Table 4, were a minor factor in total intercity passenger transport with 2.48 percent of the total passenger-miles of travel in 1965. However, the bus percentage does represent a significant portion of the 10.85-percent public carrier segment of intercity passenger transport.

TABLE 4.—INTERCITY PASSENGER-MILES, BY MODE OF TRAVEL, 1965¹

	Automobiles	Motor coaches	Total, motor vehicles	Railroads (revenue passengers)	Inland waterways	Airways (domestic revenue services)	Total
Passenger-miles (billions).....	838.1	23.3	861.4	17.5	3.1	58.1	940.1
Passenger-miles (percent).....	89.15	2.48	91.63	1.86	0.33	6.18	100.0

¹ Source: Automobile Manufacturers Association, Inc., "1967 Automobile Facts and Figures" (Detroit, Mich.: Automobile Manufacturers Association, Inc., 1968), p. 43.

Alternative monetary measures of relative traffic shares are often advocated to illustrate comparative standings of the different modes. Ton-miles and passenger-miles are suitable output measures, but the vehicle shares derived do not directly take into consideration the relative costs of shipment by different modes. One measure which could surmount this difficulty would be value added by mode per unit of output. Since in practice value-added figures are difficult to find, especially for the large non-regulated area of transport, revenue figures must be utilized. However, data on the revenue shares by vehicle size in freight transport, to compare with vehicle-

mile or ton-mile shares, are not available; such data are simply not compiled. The best obtainable estimates from government sources (see Table 5) suggest the revenue share for regulated motor carriers of passengers relative to combined motor passenger and total air carrier operations (primarily passenger) was 19.7 percent in 1965. This is a substantially greater amount than the bus share of intercity passenger-miles produced by all modes, but, of course, does not include operating and ownership costs of private auto traffic or the revenues of rail and inland water passenger carriage in the denominator. The bus share of bus and air revenues, 19.7

percent, is substantially the same as the bus share of public carrier intercity passenger-miles, 22.9 percent.² A more complete measure of the bus revenue share has been developed by the Transportation Association of America, which estimates that intercity bus passenger expenditures were \$700 million in 1965, less than 1 percent of total highway passenger expenditures of \$71,330 million.³ Accepting this latter approximation as more nearly representative, the relative role of highway passenger transport via the largest currently legal motor vehicles is under 1 percent in value terms.

TABLE 5.—TOTAL OPERATING REVENUES OF CARRIERS SUBJECT TO FEDERAL REGULATION AND PERCENT SHARE BY MODE, SELECTED YEARS, 1960-65¹

[Revenues (in thousands of dollars) and percent share]

	Railroads ²	Motor carriers of passengers	Motor carriers of property	Total, motor	Waterlines ³	Pipelines (oil)	Airlines	All carriers
1960:								
Revenues.....	10,225,554	667,033	7,213,911	7,880,944	427,408	770,417	2,129,311	21,433,634
Percent share.....	47.71	3.11	33.66	36.77	2.00	3.59	9.93	100.0
1962:								
Revenues.....	10,134,848	728,905	8,131,117	8,860,022	394,204	810,605	2,497,900	22,697,579
Percent share.....	44.65	3.21	35.82	39.03	1.74	3.57	11.00	100.0
1964:								
Revenues.....	10,602,853	802,064	9,154,776	9,956,840	405,032	865,079	3,094,628	24,924,432
Percent share.....	42.54	3.22	36.73	39.95	1.63	3.47	12.42	100.0
1965:								
Revenues.....	11,066,942	885,125	10,068,243	10,953,638	425,683	903,817	3,608,495	26,958,305
Percent share.....	41.05	3.28	37.35	40.63	1.58	3.35	13.39	100.0

¹ Source: All data except airline from U.S. Interstate Commerce Commission, Bureau of Economics, "Transport Economics, Monthly Comment" (November-December 1967), p. 22. Airline data (domestic scheduled) from U.S. Federal Aviation Agency, Office of Management Services, Data System Division, Statistical Services Branch, "FAA Statistical Handbook of Aviation: 1966 Edition," by Sylvia M. Goring (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, August 1966), p. 183.

² Rail revenues include those of steam and electric railways, switching and terminal companies, Alaskan and Hawaiian companies, REA Express, and the Pullman Co.

³ Domestic traffic.

In order to obtain an outside approximation of the portion of freight traffic revenue from intercity operations which could be involved in a change of size and weight limits, the Bureau of Public Roads' 70-percent ton-mile approximation for freight carriage on main rural roads via motor vehicles in the upper size and weight brackets can be applied to the 1965 revenue figure for motor

carriers of property given in Table 5. This procedure yields a figure of \$7,047,701 thousand or 26.1 percent of total revenues for all carriers subject to Federal regulation.

There are two reasons why this figure is far too high to represent the revenue share of all transport, including nonregulated transport, produced by larger and heavier freight vehicles. For one thing, the

biggest vehicles carry less than a 70-percent share because a portion of the ton-miles attributed to them was actually produced by small combinations and because the 70-percent figure is not typical of minor rural roads and urban streets. (About one-third of all commercial bus and combination travel was

Footnotes at end of article.

produced on urban streets and minor rural roads.¹) A second reason is that heavier vehicles have lower operating costs per ton-mile carried. Therefore, under competitive conditions, the existence of lower rates for heavier vehicles in reflection of these cost differentials would yield a lower revenue share per ton-mile for carriers using heavier vehicles than for those using smaller and lighter ones. These anticipated lower costs are a reflection of and a reason for the typical employment of larger and heavier vehicles in line-haul operations. The 70-percent ton-mile share would result in a 70-percent revenue share only if revenue per ton-mile were the same for vehicles of all sizes and weights.

A better estimate of the share of intercity motor-freight revenue that might be affected by revised size and weight limits can be calculated using the 15-percent ton-mile approximation for the largest truck-tractors. For 1965, this procedure yields a figure of \$1,510,236 thousand, or 5.6 percent of total revenues for all Federally-regulated carriers.

In summary, if higher sizes and weights were to be allowed, and if their utilization resulted in lower carrier costs and rates without offsetting public highway and social costs, it is possible that the ton-miles produced and revenue share earned by larger combinations would rise. This might occur under the stated circumstances either through attraction of traffic from other modes or by attraction of traffic presently carried by smaller motor vehicles due to a higher operating cost differential over smaller vehicles. Presently, however, the larger and heavier motor vehicles constitute no more than 1 percent of the total number of motor vehicles. They are involved in perhaps 4 percent of all motor-vehicle miles of travel, carry less than 3 percent of all intercity passenger-miles of travel, and transport slightly over 3 percent of the intercity freight ton-miles. The intercity bus share of passenger expenditures is under 1 percent of total expenditure for intercity passenger travel, and the share of the total freight operating revenue earned through carriage by larger and heavier trucks and combinations is less than 6 percent of the intercity total. While it is not the purpose of this section to neglect the responsiveness of demand for transportation services to price changes, from the statistics cited it appears clear that by any reasonable measure, the motor vehicle classes utilizing vehicles of sizes and weights likely to be affected by legislative revision are responsible for a small part of total intercity traffic and revenue in the United States.

An enumeration of present size and weight standards

Federal Standards

The provisions of the 1956 Federal-Aid Highway Act (P.L. 84-627) specifying the maximum width and weights of motor vehicles which may lawfully be operated on the 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System are as follows: Width, 96 inches; single-axle weight, 18,000 pounds; tandem-axle weight, 32,000 pounds; total gross weight, 73,280 pounds.

Subject to forfeiture of its share of funds authorized by that Act, no state may permit the use of its Interstate System mileage by vehicles or combinations exceeding the above limits, with the exception that states may retain any higher maximums permitted as of July 1, 1956. If a state maximum was below a Federal limit in 1956, the state was given permission to raise its standard on the Interstate System mileage to the Federal level. The exceptions allowed by the

grandfather clause were numerous. They are summarized in Table 6.

TABLE 6.—STATES HAVING GREATER SIZE AND WEIGHT MAXIMUMS FOR USE ON THE INTERSTATE SYSTEM THAN THE FEDERAL PROVISIONS, AS OF JULY 1, 1956¹

	State maximum
Width (inches):	
Hawaii	108
Rhode Island	102
Single-axle weight (pounds):	
Alabama	19,800
Connecticut	22,400
Delaware	20,000
District of Columbia	22,000
Florida	20,000
Hawaii	24,000
Maine	22,000
Maryland	22,400
Massachusetts	22,400
New Hampshire	22,400
New Jersey	22,400
New Mexico	21,600
New York	22,400
Ohio	19,000
Pennsylvania	22,400
Rhode Island	22,400
South Carolina	20,000
Vermont	22,400
Tandem-axle weight (pounds):	
Alabama	36,000
Colorado	36,000
Connecticut	36,000
Delaware	36,000
District of Columbia	40,000
Florida	40,000
Georgia	36,000
Maryland	40,000
Massachusetts	36,000
New Hampshire	36,000
New Mexico	34,320
New York	36,000
North Carolina	36,000
Pennsylvania	36,000
Rhode Island	(*)
Utah	33,000
Vermont	36,000
Wyoming	36,000
Gross weight (pounds):	
Alaska	76,800
Arizona	76,800
Arkansas	74,000
California	76,800
Colorado	85,280
Hawaii	73,600
Idaho	76,800
Louisiana	68,000
Michigan	81,000
Montana	76,800
Nevada	76,800
New Mexico	85,400
Ohio	78,000
Oregon	76,000
Rhode Island	88,000
Utah	79,900
Wyoming	73,950

¹ Source: Commerce Clearing House, State Motor Carriers Handbook (Chicago, Ill.: Commerce Clearing House, November 1955) pp. 1007-08.

² As of Feb. 1, 1960.

³ As of Feb. 28, 1964.

⁴ No limit specified.

⁵ As of July 1, 1959.

⁶ 56,000-pound maximum on load-bearing axles; up to 18,000 pounds may be placed on front axle.

⁷ Only on designated highways allowing 65-foot combinations.

⁸ Plus front axle.

⁹ Practical maximum. Depends on number and spacing of axles.

¹⁰ Only on highways designated by the State highway commission.

Federal width and weight regulations, it is important to note, apply only to the 41,000-mile Interstate System; the Interstate is a small portion of the total U.S. road and street plan of 3,689,666 miles (in 1965).¹⁰ However, the states do take Federal limits into account when regulating sizes and weights on other highway systems.

As Table 6 illustrates, when 8-foot width standards were adopted by the Federal government for the Interstate System, only one state exceeded that limit. Under the grandfather clause, Hawaii was allowed to retain

a 108-inch limit when admitted to statehood in 1960. Little variance in widths exists in state maximums; 8 feet has long been the standard for state highway systems. Seventeen states and the District of Columbia exceeded the single-axle weight standard which was adopted; nine of those allowed 22,400 pounds rather than 18,000. The largest deviation was by Hawaii, with 24,000 pounds allowed at the time of statehood in 1960. The Federally adopted tandem-axle weight limitation was also exceeded by 17 states and the District of Columbia. Twelve of those 18 jurisdictions had adopted 36,000-pound limits by July 1, 1956. Much the same set of states, primarily those located in the New England and Middle Atlantic areas, exceeded both axle-weight limits. Sixteen states had adopted higher gross-weight limits at the time Federal standards went into operation and most of those states were located in the far West. Six of the 16 had chosen 76,000 pounds. The highest gross weight allowed by any state, however, was authorized in Rhode Island. That state's 1956 limit for a straight truck and full trailer was 88,000 pounds, almost 15,000 pounds above the Federal limits.

State Standards

State regulation is not limited to motor vehicle widths and weights, but encompasses vehicle lengths and heights as well. The following sections will explain the technical reasons for state regulation of the several vehicle dimensions and weights. Tables will be presented to enumerate state regulatory standards by region. Average maximum standards will then be compared by region.

Vehicle width limitations.—Vehicle widths are limited for economic, physical, and psychological reasons. As wider vehicles are allowed on a highway system, lane widths must be increased from previously planned dimensions in order to accommodate vehicles of greater width while still permitting safe passing distances. Especially at high speeds, drivers desire substantial clearances between passing vehicles and will react to narrow lanes by driving on highway shoulders; such action is unsafe and may damage the roadway. Whenever vehicle width standards are increased, added public expenditures must be made to widen lanes and shoulders, or passing clearance will shrink. In the absence of additional expenditures, the capacity throughput of heavily utilized highways could fall, with investment costs rising per unit of highway output. The number of accidents per vehicle-mile could increase.

Table 7 illustrates the current situation with regard to the legal maximum vehicle widths allowed by the states. Only four state limits differ from the general 96-inch maximum (the same as the Federal limit), although numerous exceptions from the maximums are allowed by the several state administrative bodies. The most common width exceptions are for rear vision mirror and safety equipment extensions, minor load overhang, tire bulge, and movement of over-width vehicles under special permit. Occasionally a state's legislation allows extra width for buses (from 102 to 108 inches), especially for buses in metropolitan service, and short trips made by wider farm vehicles or road building machinery are generally allowed without requiring special permits. Special width exemptions are occasionally made for carriers of products deemed important to the state's economy (i.e., hogsheds of tobacco in North Carolina, beehives in Nevada, and hay or straw almost everywhere).

TABLE 7.—SUMMARY OF STATE MOTOR VEHICLE WIDTH MAXIMUM IN EFFECT AS OF JAN. 1, 1968, BY U.S. REGION¹

Northeastern region		Southern region		Midwestern region		Western region	
State	Width maximum (inches)	State	Width maximum (inches)	State	Width maximum (inches)	State	Width maximum (inches)
Connecticut.....	102	Alabama.....	96	Illinois.....	96	Alaska.....	96
Delaware.....	96	Arkansas.....	96	Indiana.....	96	Arizona.....	96
District of Columbia.....	96	Florida.....	96	Iowa.....	96	California.....	96
Maine.....	102	Georgia.....	96	Kansas.....	96	Colorado.....	96
Maryland.....	96	Kentucky.....	96	Michigan.....	96	Hawaii.....	108
Massachusetts.....	96	Louisiana.....	96	Minnesota.....	96	Idaho.....	96
New Hampshire.....	96	Mississippi.....	96	Missouri.....	96	Montana.....	96
New Jersey.....	96	North Carolina.....	96	Nebraska.....	96	Nevada.....	96
New York.....	96	South Carolina.....	96	North Dakota.....	96	New Mexico.....	96
Pennsylvania.....	96	Tennessee.....	96	Ohio.....	96	Oregon.....	96
Rhode Island.....	102	Texas.....	96	Oklahoma.....	96	Utah.....	96
Vermont.....	96	Virginia.....	96	South Dakota.....	96	Washington.....	96
		West Virginia.....	96	Wisconsin.....	96	Wyoming.....	96

¹ Source: U.S., Congress, Senate, Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works, "Vehicle Sizes and Weights," Hearings before the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works, Senate, on S. 2658, A bill to amend sec. 127 of title 23 of the United States Code relating to vehicle weight and width limitations on the Interstate System, in order to make certain

increases in such limitations, 90th Cong., 2d sess., 1968, fold-in facing p. 238.
² 96 ins. on the Interstate System.

³ 102 ins. allowed on designated State highways.

Vehicle height limitations.—Vehicle height is limited by statute in order to insure sufficient clearance of structures such as bridges, overpasses, underpasses, and tunnels. Height must also be limited to insure stable vehicle operation at high speeds, in winds, and on sharp turns. Height allowances interact with width limits because high vehicles become more stable the wider the vehicle. The narrower the vehicle, the less height can be allowed for safe operations.

Extremely large investments would be required to rebuild highway structures if height allowances were substantially increased. Alternatively, the operation of taller

vehicles could be restricted to systems containing structures of sufficient height for safe clearance.

There are practical height limits which most transporters of general freight might generally observe even were the states not to regulate in this area. The general freight transporter cannot load freight to an unrestricted height without damaging items on the lower levels. Nor can he load excessively without exceeding maximum gross-weight and axle-weight limitations. Indeed, as the Bureau of Public Roads has reported:

"Only light density commodities, gen-

erally those below 25 pounds per cubic foot, may be loaded to fill a cargo body with an overall height of 13½ feet. These commodities . . . constitute only 9 percent by weight of all commodities hauled on highways."

Table 8 shows that the states generally concur in restricting motor vehicle height to 13 feet 6 inches. Two states, Nevada and Massachusetts, do not restrict height and three states, California, Idaho, and Utah, allow operation of 14-foot tall motor vehicles. Delaware restricts heights to 12 feet 6 inches and Hawaii prohibits heights exceeding 13 feet.

TABLE 8.—SUMMARY OF STATE MOTOR VEHICLE HEIGHT MAXIMUMS IN EFFECT AS OF JAN. 20, 1968, BY U.S. REGION

Northeastern region		Southern region		Midwestern region		Western region	
State	Height maximum	State	Height maximum	State	Height maximum	State	Height maximum
Connecticut.....	13 ft. 6 in.	Alabama.....	13 ft. 6 in.	Illinois.....	13 ft. 6 in.	Alaska.....	13 ft. 6 in.
Delaware.....	13 ft. 6 in.	Arkansas.....	13 ft. 6 in.	Indiana.....	13 ft. 6 in.	Arizona.....	13 ft. 6 in.
District of Columbia.....	12 ft. 6 in.	Florida.....	13 ft. 6 in.	Iowa.....	13 ft. 6 in.	California.....	14 ft.
Maine.....	13 ft. 6 in. ¹	Georgia.....	13 ft. 6 in.	Kansas.....	13 ft. 6 in.	Colorado.....	13 ft. 6 in. ²
Maryland.....	13 ft. 6 in.	Kentucky.....	13 ft. 6 in. ²	Michigan.....	13 ft. 6 in.	Hawaii.....	13 ft.
Massachusetts.....	(?)	Louisiana.....	13 ft. 6 in.	Minnesota.....	13 ft. 6 in.	Idaho.....	14 ft.
New Hampshire.....	13 ft. 6 in.	Mississippi.....	13 ft. 6 in.	Missouri.....	13 ft. 6 in.	Montana.....	13 ft. 6 in.
New Jersey.....	13 ft. 6 in.	North Carolina.....	13 ft. 6 in.	Nebraska.....	13 ft. 6 in.	Nevada.....	(?)
New York.....	13 ft. 6 in.	South Carolina.....	13 ft. 6 in.	North Dakota.....	13 ft. 6 in.	New Mexico.....	13 ft. 6 in.
Pennsylvania.....	13 ft. 6 in.	Tennessee.....	13 ft. 6 in.	Ohio.....	13 ft. 6 in.	Oregon.....	13 ft. 6 in. ³
Rhode Island.....	13 ft. 6 in.	Texas.....	13 ft. 6 in.	Oklahoma.....	13 ft. 6 in.	Utah.....	14 ft.
Vermont.....	13 ft. 6 in.	Virginia.....	13 ft. 6 in.	South Dakota.....	13 ft. 6 in.	Washington.....	13 ft. 6 in. ⁴
		West Virginia.....	13 ft. 6 in.	Wisconsin.....	13 ft. 6 in.	Wyoming.....	13 ft. 6 in.

¹ Load may extend 6 in. above vehicle structure.

² Allowed only on designated highways. Kentucky allows only on toll roads and the Interstate with permit.

³ No limit specified.

⁴ No restriction.

⁵ Automobile transporters allowed 14 ft.

Source: Summary of Size and Weight Limits and Reciprocity Authority (Washington D.C.: American Trucking Associations Inc. Revised Jan. 20 1968).

The trend has been toward increased height allowances since the end of World War II. Table 9 illustrates this trend. In 1946, when the American Association of State Highway Officials (AASHO) recommended height limits of 12 feet 6 inches as suitable for the

then-current highway plant, the U.S. average limit was just that. AASHO revised its recommendation in 1964 and again in 1968; today the U.S. average is at that newly recommended level, 13 feet 6 inches.

TABLE 9.—AVERAGE PERMITTED HEIGHTS FOR TRUCKS, TRUCK-TRACTOR COMBINATIONS, AND BUSES, BY U.S. REGION, SELECTED YEARS, 1946-68¹

Year	U.S. regions				
	Northeastern	Southern	Midwestern	Western	Total United States
1946.....	12.5	12.5	12.5	13.0	12.6
1951.....	12.8	12.6	12.6	13.2	12.8
1956.....	12.8	12.6	12.8	13.2	12.8
1962.....	12.8	13.2	13.4	13.6	13.3
1968 ²	13.4	13.5	13.5	13.6	13.5

¹ Source: U.S. Congress, House, "Maximum Desirable Dimensions and Weights of Vehicles Operated on the Federal-Aid Systems," H. Doc. 354, 88th Cong., 2d sess., 1964, p. 91. Mean 1968 figures calculated by author from table 8, supra, p. 35.

² 1968 averages include 48 States and District of Columbia, Massachusetts and Nevada have no restriction on height. The earlier years do not include Alaska and Hawaii.

Table 10 compares state height limits in 1968 with the 1968 AASHO policy standard. There is minimal regional difference in vehicle height at the present time, but in the past the western states usually allowed slightly greater limits than states in other regions.

Exceptions exist to the state height limits for motor vehicles. Many states allow vehicles at the maximum height only on designated highways containing structures built to the highest standards. Occasionally, a single structure limits vehicle heights on a particular road. Designated highways for exceptions normally include the Interstate System, because the Department of Defense has recommended minimal vertical clearances of 16 feet on that system, and on other highways leading from Interstate routes to major ports, to meet military needs. In 1961 there were only 158 structures, 0.7 percent of the total, with less than a 14-foot clearance in the Interstate System.¹²

Footnotes at end of article.

TABLE 10.—STATE MOTOR VEHICLE HEIGHT MAXIMUMS IN 1968, COMPARED WITH 1968 AASHO POLICY STANDARD¹

Comparison with AASHO standard	Number of States, by U.S. region ²				
	Northeast	South	Midwest	West	Total, United States
Above.....	0	0	0	3	3
Same as.....	10	13	13	8	44
Below.....	1	0	0	1	2
Not specified.....	1	0	0	1	2
Total.....	12	13	13	13	51

¹ Source: Calculated by author from data of table 8, supra, p. 35, relative to 1968 American Association of State Highway Officials (AASHO) policy standard for maximum vehicle height of 13 feet 6 inches.

² Includes the District of Columbia.

There are fewer relaxations of state height maximums than is the case with most state size and weight restrictions. States sometimes allow automobile transporters to carry 14-foot loads. Road construction and maintenance machinery and farm equipment are generally excepted for short trips. Special permits are often allowed, and states on occasion exempt fire equipment, buses, and special state products (Maryland, for example, allows higher limits for plate glass and hay transport) from the overall height maximums.

Vehicle length limitations.—Motor vehicle length limitations are essential to prevent reduction of designed highway capacities and to promote safe, convenient, and rapid operation of dissimilar vehicles in the same traffic stream. Without restriction of motor vehicle and combination lengths, the utilization of longer vehicles may lead to difficult and complicated driver behavior problems during passing maneuvers. Longer vehicles and combinations may require wider paths for turning operations. (This phenomena is known as offtracking.) In addition, longer vehicles may exhibit poor braking and stability characteristics unless operated with specialized equipment modifications.

Table 11 lists the varied state restrictions of length for single-unit trucks and buses and the maximum length limits for combinations that were in effect on January 1, 1968. The state limits for single-unit vehicles are the same for buses as they are for trucks in 29 states and the District of Columbia. In 15 states, single-unit trucks are limited to 35-foot lengths and buses are allowed an additional 5 feet. The remaining six states have the following limitations: Oklahoma allows a 5-foot differential between trucks and buses (40 and 45 feet); a 4-foot differential is permitted in Indiana (36 and 40 feet); Alaska and Ohio allow buses 5 feet less length than the maximum for trucks (40 and 35 feet); Kansas permits 42.5-foot trucks but limits buses to 35 feet; and a 10-foot differential for trucks over buses has been set in Wyoming (40 feet for buses, with 50 feet allowed single-unit trucks).

TABLE 11.—SUMMARY OF STATE MOTOR VEHICLE LENGTH MAXIMUMS IN EFFECT AS OF JAN. 20, 1968, BY U.S. REGION AND STATE

U.S. region and state	Length maximums		
	Single-unit vehicle Truck (feet)	Bus (feet)	Maximum combination (feet)
Northeastern:			
Connecticut.....	55.0	55	55
Delaware.....	40.0	40	60
District of Columbia.....	40.0	40	50
Maine.....	55.0	55	55
Maryland.....	55.0	55	65
Massachusetts.....	35.0	40	55
New Hampshire.....	35.0	40	55
New Jersey.....	35.0	35	55
New York.....	35.0	40	55
Pennsylvania.....	35.0	40	55
Rhode Island.....	40.0	40	55
Vermont.....	55.0	55	55
Midwestern:			
Illinois.....	42.0	42	165
Indiana.....	36.0	40	65
Iowa.....	35.0	35	60

TABLE 11.—SUMMARY OF STATE MOTOR VEHICLE LENGTH MAXIMUMS IN EFFECT AS OF JAN. 20, 1968, BY U.S. REGION AND STATE—Continued

U.S. region and state	Length maximums		
	Single-unit vehicle Truck (feet)	Bus (feet)	Maximum combination (feet)
Midwestern—Continued			
Kansas.....	42.5	35	65
Michigan.....	35.0	40	165
Minnesota.....	40.0	40	55
Missouri.....	40.0	40	165
Nebraska.....	40.0	40	65
North Dakota.....	35.0	35	165
Ohio.....	40.0	35	65
Oklahoma.....	40.0	45	65
South Dakota.....	35.0	40	165
Wisconsin.....	35.0	40	355
Southern:			
Alabama.....	40.0	40	55
Arkansas.....	40.0	40	65
Florida.....	35.0	40	55
Georgia.....	55.0	55	55
Kentucky.....	35.0	35	455
Louisiana.....	35.0	40	65
Mississippi.....	35.0	40	55
North Carolina.....	35.0	35	55
South Carolina.....	35.0	35	355
Tennessee.....	40.0	40	55
Texas.....	40.0	40	65
Virginia.....	35.0	40	55
West Virginia.....	35.0	35	155
Western:			
Alaska.....	40.0	35	65
Arizona.....	40.0	40	65
California.....	40.0	40	65
Colorado.....	35.0	40	165
Hawaii.....	40.0	40	65
Idaho.....	35.0	40	65
Montana.....	35.0	40	735
Nevada.....	40.0	40	70
New Mexico.....	40.0	40	65
Oregon.....	35.0	40	65
Utah.....	45.0	45	65
Washington.....	35.0	35	65
Wyoming.....	50.0	40	65

TABLE 13.—STATE MOTOR VEHICLE LENGTH MAXIMUMS IN 1968 COMPARED WITH 1968 AASHO POLICY STANDARDS¹

Comparison with AASHO standard	Number of States by U.S. region ²				
	Northeast	South	Midwest	West	Total United States
Single-unit truck length					
Above.....	4	1	2	2	9
Same as.....	3	4	5	6	18
Below.....	5	8	6	5	24
Total.....	12	13	13	13	51
Single-unit bus length					
Above.....	4	1	2	1	8
Same as.....	7	8	7	10	32
Below.....	1	4	4	2	11
Total.....	12	13	13	13	51
Truck-tractor combination length					
Above.....	0	0	0	1	1
Same as.....	0	3	10	12	25
Below.....	12	10	3	0	25
Total.....	12	13	13	13	51

¹ Source: Calculated by author from data of table 11, supra, pp. 39-40, relative to 1968 American Association of State Highway Officials (AASHO) policy standards for single-unit vehicle length of 40 ft. and maximum truck-tractor combination length of 65 ft.

² Includes the District of Columbia.

¹ Allowed only on designated highways. Illinois and Maryland, allowed on 4-lane roads.

² 40 ft. for 3-axle vehicles.

³ 60 ft. allowed auto transporters; 65 ft. in Wisconsin with annual permit.

⁴ Allowed only on designated toll roads and the Interstate System by permit. In Kentucky, trucks limited to 26.5 ft. and buses limited to 30 ft. on non-State maintained highways.

⁵ 60 ft. for articulated buses only.

⁶ 98-ft. triples to be permitted in Idaho on designated roads.

⁷ 105-ft. triples allowed in Nevada on designated roads.

⁸ 70 ft. plus 5-ft. overhang for stinger-steered auto transporters with permit.

⁹ Oregon State Highway Commission may authorize 105-ft. triples combinations by resolution or permit.

¹⁰ 68 ft. for auto transporters.

Source: Summary of Size and Weight Limits and Reciprocity Authority (Washington, D.C.: American Trucking Associations, Inc., revised Jan. 20, 1968), except for bus data, from U.S. Congress, Senate Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works, Vehicle Sizes and Weights, hearings before the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works, Senate, on S. 2658, a bill to amend sec. 127 of title 23 of the United States Code relating to vehicle weight and width limitations on the Interstate System, in order to make certain increases in such limitations, 90th Cong., 2d sess., 1968, fold-in facing p. 238.

Table 12 illustrates the median lengths of single-unit trucks and buses. According to that table, the Northeast and South permit 35-foot truck lengths, on the average, while the Midwest and West commonly allow length maxima exceeding 35 feet. The median permitted bus length is the same in all regions of the country.

TABLE 12.—MEDIAN PERMITTED LENGTHS FOR TRUCKS, BUSES, AND TRUCK-TRACTOR COMBINATIONS, BY U.S. REGION, 1968¹

U.S. region	Median length maxima by vehicle type		
	Single-unit vehicles		Maximum combination (feet)
	Trucks (feet)	Buses (feet)	
Northeast.....	35	40	55.0
South.....	35	40	55.0
Midwest.....	38	40	65.0
West.....	40	40	65.0
Total U.S.	40	40	62.5

¹ Median lengths calculated by author from data of table 11, supra, pp. 39-40.

Table 13 shows that few states exceed the 40-foot AASHO recommendation for the length of single-unit trucks. Almost half of the states have decided on 35 feet as the desirable limitation. About two-thirds of the states adhere to the 40-foot AASHO standard for buses.

The maximum legal operating length for vehicle combinations is also shown in Table 11. These length restrictions apply to combinations consisting of a truck-tractor motive unit plus one or more semitrailers or full trailers. Combinations are generally, but not always, allowed greater lengths than single-unit trucks, perhaps mainly because combinations are more maneuverable. As will be noted in Chapter VI, the longer combination containing two trailer units may off-track less than single semitrailers of lesser total length.

The median upper limit for combination length permitted in the U.S. is 62.5 feet, as shown in Table 12. As the median figures indicate, the eastern half of the country generally limits combinations to 55 feet (allowing a single semitrailer towed by a truck-tractor) while the western half more commonly permits 65-foot combinations (two semitrailers are normally allowed). From Table 13 it may be seen that the states are split almost equally in number between those adhering to the 1968 AASHO standard, which suggests a 65-foot maximum for combinations, and those which allow shorter combinations. Nevada, which had no length limitation until 1967, permits 70-foot doubles combinations; under special permit Nevada allows 105-foot triples combinations, as does Oregon. Idaho passed permissive legislation for 98-foot triples combinations in 1967 but has not as yet designated highways for their use.¹³

In most states, vehicles longer than the state maximums are allowed to operate under special permits. Certain categories of vehicle are often excepted from length restrictions without special permit, such as trucks transporting logs or poles. Farm machinery and emergency public equipment are usually allowed to exceed state maximums. Some states permit the load to overhang the vehicle (up to 12 feet total, front plus rear, in Louisiana). Many states allow operation of longer equipment by transporters of commodities believed especially important to that state's economy. Thus, longer vehicles may be used to carry cotton in California; motor vehicles or vehicle bodies in Michigan; flax fiber in Minnesota; oil field equipment in Oklahoma; and boats for use in intercollegiate rowing contests in Maryland.

Vehicle weight limitations—rationale.—Highway construction standards and maintenance requirements for pavements and structures are directly predicated on the axle weights of vehicles expected to use the highways and on the frequency with which those weights occur. According to the Bureau of Public Roads, the effects of excessive weights are as follows:

"A modest increase in axle weights can decrease the serviceability and shorten the life of the structure. A significant increase in axle weights can cause serious deterioration in the structure with failure imminent if it is not quickly reconstructed or replaced. The establishment of vehicle weight standards greater than those for which a highway system has been designed can require (1) the additional surfacing or reconstruction of the pavement structures; (2) the strengthening or replacement of bridge structures; (3) the increased levels of maintenance; and (4) increased financial burdens and commitments of public funds."¹⁴

According to the Ottawa, Illinois, road tests concerning the effects of axle loads on pavements, with given serviceability and thickness indexes, "... the effect of a single truck axle conforming to present Federal standards (18,000 pounds) is similar to that produced by considerably more than 3,000 axles of a conventional automobile (2,000 pounds) ..."¹⁵

Heavy trucks and combinations may produce excessive stress on bridges and other highway structures with consequent risk of

failure. Bridge structure capacity is predicated upon gross vehicle weights in relation to the manner in which that weight is concentrated on the structure. Weight, as a cost occasioning parameter for highway structures, must be evaluated in conjunction with axle loads and axle spacings. While high weight by itself may not be a factor in bridge failure, vehicle configurations which produce no undue wear on pavements can overstress structures by concentrating weight in too limited an area of a bridge.¹⁶

Thus it appears that gross vehicle weights, coupled with specified axle loadings, axle spacings, and frequencies of axle loadings, may serve as valid parameters of highway structure and pavement construction and maintenance costs. In order to protect the public investment in highways and to provide least-cost construction commensurate with economic needs of commerce, the states have undertaken regulation of vehicle axle and gross-weight characteristics.

Vehicle weight limitations—practices.—There are distinct regional differences in state axle-weight limits for motor vehicles, as shown in Table 14. Uniformly, except for Delaware, the northeastern states permit 22,400-pound loads on single axles. The District of Columbia and 9 of 11 states in that region permit tandem-axle loads in excess of 32,000 pounds. On the other hand, no midwestern state allows axle weights in excess of 19,000 pounds for single axles and 32,000 pounds for tandems. Only 3 of the 26 southern and western states permit single-axle loads exceeding 20,000 pounds and only 9 of 26 have legalized tandem-axle loads of more than 32,000 pounds.

TABLE 14.—SUMMARY OF STATE MOTOR VEHICLE SINGLE-AXLE, TANDEM-AXLE, AND GROSS-WEIGHT MAXIMUMS IN EFFECT AS OF JAN. 1, 1968, BY U.S. REGION AND STATE¹

U.S. region and State	Weight maximums (pounds)		
	Single-axle	Tandem-axle	Gross
Northeastern:			
Connecticut.....	22,400	36,000	73,000
Delaware.....	20,000	36,000	73,280
District of Columbia.....	22,000	38,000	70,000
Maine.....	22,000	* 32,000	73,280
Maryland.....	22,400	40,000	73,280
Massachusetts.....	22,400	36,000	73,000
New Hampshire.....	22,400	36,000	73,280
New Jersey.....	22,400	32,000	73,280
New York.....	22,400	36,000	71,000
Pennsylvania.....	22,400	36,000	73,280
Rhode Island.....	22,400	(*)	88,000
Vermont.....	22,400	36,000	73,280
Midwestern:			
Illinois.....	* 18,000	32,000	73,280
Indiana.....	* 18,000	* 32,000	73,000
Iowa.....	18,000	32,000	73,280
Kansas.....	18,000	32,000	73,280
Michigan.....	18,000	* 26,000	* 102,000
Minnesota.....	18,000	32,000	73,280
Missouri.....	18,000	32,000	* 73,280
Nebraska.....	18,000	32,000	73,280
North Dakota.....	18,000	32,000	73,280
Ohio.....	19,000	* 24,000	78,000
Oklahoma.....	18,000	32,000	73,280
South Dakota.....	18,000	32,000	73,280
Wisconsin.....	18,000	32,000	73,000
Southern:			
Alabama.....	18,000	36,000	73,280
Arkansas.....	18,000	32,000	73,280
Florida.....	20,000	40,000	73,271
Georgia.....	18,000	36,000	73,280
Kentucky.....	18,000	* 32,000	73,280
Louisiana.....	18,000	32,000	76,000
Mississippi.....	18,000	28,650	* 73,280
North Carolina.....	18,000	36,000	73,280
South Carolina.....	20,000	32,000	73,280
Tennessee.....	18,000	32,000	72,000
Texas.....	18,000	32,000	72,000
Virginia.....	18,000	32,000	70,000
West Virginia.....	18,000	32,000	73,280
Western:			
Alaska.....	20,000	24,000	90,000
Arizona.....	18,000	32,000	76,800
California.....	18,000	32,000	76,800
Colorado.....	18,000	36,000	76,000
Hawaii.....	24,000	32,000	80,000
Idaho.....	18,000	32,000	76,800
Montana.....	20,000	34,000	76,000
Nevada.....	18,000	32,000	76,800
New Mexico.....	21,600	34,320	86,400
Oregon.....	* 18,000	* 32,000	76,000

TABLE 14.—SUMMARY OF STATE MOTOR VEHICLE SINGLE-AXLE, TANDEM-AXLE, AND GROSS-WEIGHT MAXIMUMS IN EFFECT AS OF JAN. 1, 1968, BY U.S. REGION AND STATE—Continued

U.S. region and State	Weight maximums (pounds)		
	Single-axle	Tandem-axle	Gross
Western—Continued			
Utah.....	18,000	33,000	79,900
Washington.....	18,000	32,000	72,000
Wyoming.....	18,000	32,000	73,950

¹ Source: U.S. Congress, Senate, Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works, "Vehicle Sizes and Weights," hearings before the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works, Senate, on S. 2658, a bill to amend sec. 127 of title 23 of the United States Code relating to vehicle weight and width limitations on the Interstate System, in order to make certain increases in such legislation, 90th Cong., 2d sess., 1968, fold-in facing p. 238.

* 36,000 lbs. allowed on State highways.

* Not specified.

* Allowed only on designated highways.

* On designated highways: single axle, 22,400 lbs.; tandem axle, 36,000 lbs.

* 32,000 lbs. on designated highways.

* 32,000 lbs. on axles over 4 ft. but less than 8 ft. apart; 38,000 lbs. if more than 8 ft. apart.

* Oregon State Highway Commission may grant 20,000-lb. single- and 34,000-lb. tandem-axle weights on all State highways by resolution or permit.

The situation with gross vehicle weight allowances is quite the opposite. Only Rhode Island of the northeastern states permits gross weights to exceed 73,280 pounds. Louisiana alone of the southern states and only 2 of 13 midwestern states allow gross weights of more than 73,280 pounds. However, only 1 of 13 western states limits maximum gross weight to 73,280 pounds or less, and that state (Washington) permits 76,000 gross on certified routes.¹⁷

Vehicle weight limitations—exemptions.—Perhaps in no area of state size and weight regulation are there more exceptions from the standard maximums than are found in the case of axle loads. These exceptions specify weights both higher and lower than nominal state maximums. In the case of low-grade highways and in certain seasons, motor vehicles are held to lower weights. On the other hand, axle-load maximums are raised above the standard limits in numerous instances. In many states, every vehicle operator has a built-in exemption in the form of either a 3- or 5-percent tolerance in axle weights; which percentage depends on the state. Sometimes, tolerance is expressed in terms of pounds, as when 500 or 1,000 pounds excess weight is allowed for a single axle and 2,000 or 4,000 pounds for tandems. Special exemptions are allowed for a list of carriers and commodities including, but not limited to, petroleum, tobacco, milk, livestock, general agricultural products, logs, ore, sand, concrete, construction vehicles, and refrigerated trucks. Buses are sometimes given special exemptions.

Gross-weight limits seem to have been the subject of fewer exemptions for special products. But perhaps such exemptions are not needed, because gross weights are often allowed to exceed legal maximums by greater tolerances than are allowed axle weights. Tolerances may be stated in pounds (such as 4,000 pounds above a 70,000-pound gross) or as a percent. They range upward from 3 percent to 5, 10, and 15 percent of gross.

In summary, as may be seen by reference to Table 14, axle-weight allowances are highest in the Northeast, while the highest modal gross weights are permitted in the West. As listed in Table 15, in relation to the 1968 AASHO weight standards, 33 state maximums are less than the recommended 20,000-pound single-axle loading. In 29 states, tandem-axle maximums equaled the 32,000-pound recommendation. Only three states equaled or exceeded the recommended gross-weight maximum of 86,500 pounds.

TABLE 15.—STATE MOTOR VEHICLE WEIGHT MAXIMUMS IN 1968 COMPARED WITH 1968 AASHO POLICY STANDARDS¹

Comparison with AASHO standard	Number of States by U.S. region ²				
	Northeast	South	Midwest	West	Total United States
Single-axle weight					
Above.....	11	0	0	2	13
Same as.....	1	2	0	2	5
Below.....	0	11	13	9	33
Total.....	12	13	13	13	51
Tandem-axle weight					
Above.....	9	4	0	5	18
Same as.....	2	8	11	8	29
Below.....	0	1	2	0	3
Not specified.....	1	0	0	0	1
Total.....	12	13	13	13	51
Gross weight					
Above.....	1	0	1	1	3
Same as.....	0	0	0	0	0
Below.....	11	13	12	12	48
Total.....	12	13	13	13	51

¹ Source: Calculated by author from data of table 13 supra p. 43 relative to 1968 American Association of State Highway Officials (AASHO) policy standards for single-axle weight of 20,000 lbs., tandem-axle weight of 32,000 lbs., and maximum gross weight of 86,500 lbs.

² Includes the District of Columbia.

Directions of change in vehicle standards
The brief survey of state size and weight maximums has illustrated the similarity of

state standards, especially those pertaining to vehicle height and width. It has also brought out the general patterns of di-

versity in weights and lengths. Long vehicle combinations are general in the West; longer single-unit trucks are common in the Northeast. High gross weights are permitted in the West; high axle weights are characteristic of the Northeast.

Not apparent in the preceding tables is the direction of change in state size and weight limits over the past decade. There has been a general trend toward increased state size and weight limits. State legislatures are pressed by highway users to continually review their existing standards and to consider relaxation of size and weight limits to allow general use on state highways of longer, wider, taller, or heavier commercial vehicles. In addition, operators frequently ask for specific commodity or route exemptions from the general standards.

The apparent general trend toward relaxed motor vehicle size and weight limits is exemplified by the American Association of State Highway Officials' recommended standards. AASHO, which began in the 1930's to establish what its members felt were desirable overall limits for use on U.S. highways, promulgated standards for weights and size dimensions in 1946, in 1964, and again in 1968. Over this 22-year period, increases were recommended in two of three weight categories (single-axle and gross weights) and in all major size dimensions (height, single-vehicle and combination length, and width). As the following table shows, the recommended increases were major ones.

TABLE 16.—INCREASES IN AASHO POLICY STANDARDS, 1946-68¹

	Width	Height	Length		Weight		
			Single vehicle	Maximum combination	Single axle	Tandem axle	Gross
Amount of increase.....	6 ins.	12 ins.	5 ft.	5 ft.	2,000 lbs.		14,600 lbs.
Percent increase.....	6.3	8	14.3	8.3	11.1		20.3

¹ Source: U.S. Congress, Senate, Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works, "Vehicle Sizes and Weights," hearings before the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works, Senate, on S. 2658, A bill to amend sec. 127 of title 23 of the United States Code relating to vehicle weight and width limitations on the Interstate System, in order to make certain increases in such limitations, 90th Cong., 2d sess., 1968, fold-in facing p. 238.

In all cases except vehicle height, the 1968 AASHO recommendations exceed the current 1968 median state limits. They also exceed the Federal standards established in 1956 for single-axle weights, gross vehicle weights, and widths.

In practice, certain dimensions have been static while the maximums for others have been raised by the states rapidly. Of all the limits, the most rapid change has taken place in vehicle lengths. State maximums for truck-tractor combinations have risen greatly, beginning with the western states

and spreading to the Midwest and South. In the four years from January 1, 1964, to January 1, 1968, 19 states passed legislation authorizing the operation of 65-foot doubles combinations. Prior to the last few years, 65-foot doubles had been authorized only in eight western states. Today, doubles may be operated on designated state highways and the Interstate System in 27 states and on a limited mileage of public toll roads in three additional states. The states involved are set forth in Table 17.

been changed since they were placed in effect in 1956. However, as will be brought out in the next section, proposals are currently before Congress for increased width and weight limitations on motor vehicles operating over the Interstate System.

Arguments by highway user interests for revised standards

Why have standards been increased in the past decade and why are there now extensive legislative efforts to raise the Federal and state maximums? The answer of the Bureau of Public Roads in its report to Congress on sizes and weights is as follows:

"The pace of technological development of both highway facilities and vehicles is dynamic. If the Nation is to fully utilize these developments, the standards for highways and vehicles cannot remain static for long periods but should be continuously reexamined."¹⁸

Vehicle operators have long argued that larger and heavier vehicles allow them to haul freight or passengers at lower ton-mile and passenger-mile costs. Operators are not very explicit about the magnitude of private cost savings resulting from their use of larger and heavier vehicles, but in general their arguments that private cost savings often result have not been seriously contradicted.

If the social costs and the additional costs of providing highway facilities are not taken into account, it is probably true that the private costs of the line-haul operations of highway carriers can be lowered through the adoption of heavier and larger vehicles and vehicle combinations. However, in any

TABLE 17.—TRENDS IN THE EXTENSION OF 65-FOOT DOUBLES COMBINATIONS BY AUTHORIZATION OF STATE LEGISLATURES¹

States allowing 65-ft. doubles operation on Dec. 31, 1963	States legalizing 65-ft. doubles operation from Jan. 1, 1964, to Jan. 1, 1968	Additional States allowing operation of 65-ft. doubles on public toll roads
Arizona. California. Idaho. Montana. Nevada. New Mexico. Oregon. Washington. Wyoming.	Alaska. Arkansas. Colorado. Delaware. Hawaii. Illinois. Indiana. Kansas. Kentucky. Maryland.	Michigan. Missouri. Nebraska. North Dakota. Ohio. Oklahoma. South Dakota. Texas. Utah.
		Massachusetts (Massachusetts Turnpike). New York (New York Thruway). Pennsylvania (Pennsylvania Turnpike).

¹ Source: Western Highway Institute, "Increasing Interest in Doubles Combinations," Research Summary Series (Western Highway Institute, San Francisco, Calif., Aug. 4, 1967), pp. 1-2. (Mimeographed.) Also, personal letter from Fred J. Myers, research director, Western Highway Institute, San Francisco, Calif., Feb. 21, 1968.

The most recent and controversial change in combination lengths has been the authorization of triples combination operations in Idaho and Oregon, at the discretion of the state highway commissions. Nevada, which had no vehicle length limits until

1967, also presently allows triples operations, as has been the case for years. Longer combinations (70 to 108 feet) are permitted to be operated on several eastern toll roads, in addition.

Federal size and weight limits have not

Footnotes at end of article.

economic assessment of the effects of relaxed size and weight limitations on operating economy, consideration must also be given to the social and highway costs as well as to lower vehicular costs. Cost data and information on social and highway costs will be presented later in this study.

The existence of exemptions from state maximums for the carriage of beehives in Nevada and for highway transport of oil field equipment in Oklahoma appears sufficient evidence that carrier and producer arguments for lower maximums are sometimes accepted by state legislative bodies. Such revised standards to benefit particular groups are presumably adopted as being in the public interest. The pressures of special highway user interests in the political arena might be expected to result in some expansion of legislative maximums over time, even when, all factors considered, such expansion does not serve overall economic efficiency.

However, the trucking and bus interests have presented some special reasons for extensions of general size and weight limitations at this time. These factors were stated in the report of the Bureau of Public Roads on optimal sizes and weights of motor vehicles permitted to use the Interstate Highway System. This report was requested by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 and recommended standards for the Interstate Highway System based on road test findings. Quoting from industry sources, the BPR stated the following:

"Marketing procedures are undergoing a revolution. New techniques call for the shipment of products directly from mill to user. Examples include steel, textiles, wood products, builders' supplies, and items of defense.

"Present limitations on sizes and weights contribute to uneconomical operation. Costs are constantly rising. The only way to keep abreast of these increasing costs is to carry more freight per vehicle.

"In the last 2 to 3 years, the average freight movement in the United States was 240 tons per family or 70 tons per individual per year. Considering the population growth our country is undergoing, it is obvious that more freight movement is going to be required to serve the public. It behooves us to accomplish this as efficiently as possible."

The Bureau of Public Roads reported the opinion of the National Association of Motor Bus Owners in the following terms:

"An increase in vehicle width is essential in the interest of safety and passenger appeal and comfort. As to safety, the increase would permit a lower center of gravity, wider brake drums and more space between dual tires to reduce heating hazards. The additional 6 inches is essential to permit slightly wider seats and aisles; under present limits the former are too narrow for real comfort for some passengers and aisles should be wider both for safety and comfort.

"It is necessary constantly to improve bus design in the interest of safety and passenger appeal. It is impossible without complete reengineering, which is patently impractical, to add further refinements to those made in recent years without running the risk of exceeding an 18,000-pound load on the rear axle of single-deck coaches. The addition of rest rooms, now considered essential, and the transfer of air-conditioning equipment from a separate unit to the propulsion engine in the rear aggravate this problem despite the use of lighter weight materials. While the deck-and-a-half buses have tandem axles, this is impractical for single-deck coaches. It is also necessary to provide for accumulations of mud, snow, and ice which cannot always be removed fre-

quently, particularly in the case of transcontinental runs. Modern bus design makes it impossible to put much over a third of the weight on the front axle."

It appears that carrier sources at the time of the 1964 report by the Bureau of Public Roads were utilizing three principal arguments for increased standards. These were: (1) costs are rising, therefore technical change in vehicle size and weights is needed to keep unit costs down; (2) greater sizes and weights will allow carriers to provide better service; and (3) industry and consumer demands for transportation are growing and these demands should be met as efficiently as possible.

One argument used by the trucking industry, in line with the third point above, is illustrated by the following statement of Senator Warren G. Magnuson (Washington):

"It is true that some changes have been made since 1956 in those States where standards were below the Federal limits. But the fact today is that since 1963 all States are at a standstill as far as the effective size and weight improvements are concerned. Thus, while mile after mile of new highway has been laid down in large part with enormous tax payments made by the trucking industry, the Nation's truck fleet has been denied the opportunity to combine increased truck efficiency with improved highway standards."

A further reason for the interest of truckers in expanding size and weight maximums surely must be the renaissance of the railroads in recent years. The rail share of total intercity freight traffic, which fell dramatically for many years to the truckers' gain,¹ has held approximately steady since 1960.² The motor carrier share has ceased to rise. The implicit argument of motor carriers must therefore be that, unless allowed to operate with larger legal payloads, trucking's competitive position will be threatened. Of course, to evaluate the soundness of such an argument, it would be necessary first to inquire whether all other avenues of cost reduction had been pursued. Secondly, it would be necessary to determine the level of excess profits in the trucking industry and the price elasticity of demand. If trucking's relative traffic share could be retained through reduced rates, no threat would exist (assuming the revenue composition of the share remained unchanged). The only

threatened parameter would be the level of excess profits.

Thus, because of changed cost conditions, increased intermodal competition, and improvements in highway plant, motor carriers have argued that substantial increases should be made in the maximum permitted size and weight standards applicable to the Interstate System and to other systems of state highways. Arguments to the contrary by other groups will be recognized in detail in Chapter IV; that chapter also summarizes and discusses more recent statements by advocates of greater size and weight standards.

Proposed motor vehicle standards

Cost increases and highway improvement factors, as described in the above section, have led to several proposals for revised size and weight standards. This section will set forth the major proposals directly presented by highway users or indirectly resulting from their pressure for changes.

Transportation Association of America

The User Panel of the TAA has suggested a set of limits to govern use of the Interstate System by commercial vehicles. These limits are shown in Table 18. The recommended maximums were the result of the efforts of an advisory committee consisting of representatives of the American Trucking Associations, the Rubber Manufacturers Association, the National Highway Users Conference, the Truck Trailers Manufacturers Association, the Private Truck Council of America, and the Automobile Manufacturers Association. All the above are business interests highly dependent on highway facilities. The TAA's limits were first presented to the public in November, 1967.

American Association of State Highway Officials

The AASHO standards listed in Table 18 come from that group's 1964 recommendations for maximum sizes and weights to be used on the Interstate and other Federal-aid systems. Those maximums reflect the positions of state highway engineers and officials. The only AASHO recommendations which differ in a major way from current state practice are the 88,000-pound gross-weight limits (86,500 pounds in 1968) and the 102-inch width maximum.

TABLE 18.—RECOMMENDED MOTOR VEHICLE SIZES AND WEIGHTS BY SPONSORING GROUP, AS OF JAN. 1, 1968

Size and weight dimensions	Recommendations by sponsoring group			
	1964 Bureau of Public Roads report ¹	AASHO ²	TAA ³	Magnuson bill, S. 2658 ⁴
Width (inches).....	102	102	102	102
Height (feet).....	13½	13½	13½	(9)
Length (feet):				
Single-unit vehicle.....	40	40	40	(9)
Maximum combination.....	65	65	70	(9)
Axle weights (pounds):				
Single axle.....	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Tandem axle.....	32,000	32,000	36,000	36,000
Maximum gross weight (pounds).....	104,000	88,000	102,200	150,000

¹ Source: U.S. Congress, House, "Maximum Desirable Dimensions and Weights of Vehicles Operated on the Federal-Aid Systems," H. Doc. 354, 88th Cong., 2d sess., 1964, pp. 2-6.

² Source: "Report, A Monthly Commentary from the Transportation Association of America," Nov. 21, 1967, p. 4.

³ Gross weight proposal of 86,500 lbs., February 1968. U.S. Congress, Senate, Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works, "Vehicle Sizes and Weights," hearings before the Subcommittee on Public Works, Senate, on S. 2658, A bill to amend sec. 127 of title 23 of the United States Code relating to vehicle weight and width limitations on the Interstate System, in order to make certain increases in such limitations, 90th Cong., 2d sess., 1968, fold-in facing p. 238.

⁴ Source: "Motor Vehicle Size and Weight Limitations Proposal," TAA background paper (Washington, D.C.: Transportation Association of America, November 1967), attachment E.

⁵ Source: U.S. Congress, Senate, "A Bill to Amend Section 127 of Title 23 of the United States Code Relating to Vehicle Weight and Width Limitations on the Interstate System, in Order to Make Certain Increases in Such Limitations," S. 2658, 90th Cong., 1st sess., 1967.

⁶ No recommendation.

⁷ Calculated by author, given 75 ft. triples combinations. Gross weight in this proposal depends entirely on the following formula:

$$W = 500 \left(\frac{LN}{N-1} + 12N + 40 \right)$$

where L = wheel base
and N = number of axles.

Bureau of Public Roads

The 1964 standards of the Bureau of Public Roads stem from research by that agency and the Highway Research Board. According to then-Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges, the recommended sizes and weights "... are justified on the basis of present research as well as on projected improvements in the Interstate System. They will bring great benefits to the public generally and to the motor carrier industry specifically."²⁴ The BPR standards shown in Table 18 differ from current practice mainly in allowing greater gross weights. However, it should be noted that the BPR's recommendations include Federal standards on height and length; the 1956 Federal-Aid Act placed limitations only on width and weight characteristics. Moreover, the width proposal of 102 inches is 6 inches wider than the most common state width standard.

Interestingly, the 1964 report of the BPR also suggested imposition of vehicle performance standards (described and evaluated in Chapter VI) relating to power, braking, and trailer linkage.

Magnuson Bill

The Magnuson bill seeks to amend size and weight standards in Section 127 of Title 23 of the U. S. Code (the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956). This bill, S. 2658, was adopted in an amended form by the Senate on April 4, 1968.²⁵ Senator Magnuson's bill does not suggest additional standards for height and length as do the other proposals given in Table 18. Instead, his bill would increase widths and axle loads similarly to the TAA's proposal and increase gross weight on the basis of a formula, yielding a far higher gross-weight limitation.

The formula in the Magnuson bill makes gross-weight limits dependent upon vehicle wheelbase and the number of axles. In states allowing 65-foot doubles combinations, maximum weights could lie in the vicinity of 90,000 pounds,²⁶ but maximum gross allowances could rise to 150,000 pounds in states permitting 75-foot triples combinations or even more in states permitting 105-foot triples. These figures are far above the gross-weight maximums obtainable under other current proposals.

Summary and conclusions

Unquestionably, the motor carrier industry is quite interested in immediate upward revision of present size and weight standards. Point number 1 on the 1968 "Program for Progress" of Chairman Orrin Fraley of the Regular Common Carrier Conference (ATA) was "... liberalized sizes and weights in commercial trucking operations over Federal and state highways."²⁷ Chairman Fraley makes the following statement.

"We enter 1968 with interstate trucking operations over the most advanced highways restricted to sizes and weights which were recommended in 1946 for all streets and highways. In 1956, under the Federal Interstate Defense Highway Act, certain of these recommendations were adopted as national standards. The effect of this has been to 'freeze' size and weight limitations at levels which are unrealistically low for modern highways and are now more than two decades behind the times.

"This condition amounts to a restraint of trade since many thousands of miles of improved highways, both Federal and state, could now safely accommodate commercial vehicles of larger sizes and weights. Legislation has been introduced to thaw this freeze; its passage in 1968 would increase motor carrier efficiency and benefit all who depend upon commercial transportation."²⁸

In a year-end statement, William Bresnahan, the managing director of the American Trucking Associations, Inc., stated the industry's case as follows:

"Liberalization of size and weight regulations of motor carriers will be a major concern of the industry during the coming year.

The need for greater productivity to offset continued increases in labor and other costs makes this imperative. Legislation has been introduced in Congress to thaw the freeze in size and weight limits imposed on the states in 1956. The proposed legislation would permit using the Interstate and Defense Highway System, commensurate with the greater capabilities of modern highways."²⁹

The position of the commercial motor vehicle users seems abundantly clear. They are the demanders of increased maximums. Associated with these repeated demands, of course, will be additional highway construction and maintenance costs, or lower standards of safety and convenience for other highway users. Thus the question must be raised: Will the demanders be willing—or receive sufficient benefits so that they are able—to pay for these additional costs?

This chapter has introduced the current situation with regard to state and Federal motor vehicle size and weight standards, listed several current proposals for standards revision, and pointed out the arguments used by highway interests to demand increased maximums. The remainder of this study will attempt to evaluate the economic soundness of the proposed size and weight standards revisions, not only from the viewpoint of the concerned highway users, but also from society's more comprehensive and significant interest in an efficient use of economic resources. Before the facts necessary for such an evaluation can be presented, the next chapter will place the relevant economic issues in sharper focus and describe the methods of economic analysis which this study will utilize.

FOOTNOTES

¹ 2-axle, 6-tire and 3-axle vehicles.

² That is, 2-axle, 4-tire size.

³ U.S. Congress, House, *Maximum Desirable Dimensions and Weights of Vehicles Operated on the Federal-Aid Systems*, H. Doc. 354, 88th Cong., 2d sess., 1964, p. 47. Hereinafter referred to as H. Doc. 354.

⁴ For 1964, the gross ton-miles produced by 5-or-more-axle combinations operating on the Federal-aid systems totaled 143 billion. The total produced by all trucks and combinations on those highways was 892 billion, or 776 billion eliminating the travel by 2-axle, 4-tire trucks. Assuming a $\frac{2}{3}$ load factor (67%) and tare weight equal to 40% of gross, those gross ton-mile figures reduce to cargo ton-mile figures of 47 and 312 billion respectively. Thus, 47 billion ton-miles carried by the largest and heaviest combinations equals 15% of the total freight traffic on the Federal-aid system. This 15%-figure can be assumed generally correct for the intercity share of the maximum-sized vehicles because traffic on the non-Federal-aid system is a small part of total intercity freight ton-mileage, and because the largest vehicles also utilize the non-Federal-aid system in about the same proportion. See U.S. Congress, House, *Final Report of the Highway Cost Allocation Study*, H. Doc. 54, 87th Cong., 1st sess., 1961, p. 276. Hereinafter referred to as H. Doc. 54.

⁵ See Table 1 and Table 4.

⁶ Motor vehicle share of 22%, times truck-tractor combination share of 15%, yields 3.3%.

⁷ The bus share of bus and air revenues is obtained from Table 5: $3.28\%/16.67\% = 19.7\%$. The bus share of intercity passenger-miles for hire is obtained from Table 4: $2.48\%/10.85\% = 22.9\%$.

⁸ Frank A. Smith, "Relative Role of Highway Transport in the U.S. Economy," in *Freight Transportation Economics*, Highway Research Record No. 175 (Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council, 1967), p. 30.

⁹ Commercial bus and combination travel in 1965 of 22,916 billion vehicle-miles on main rural roads, divided by total travel of

the above vehicles on all road types, equals 64.7%. See Table 2, *supra*, p. 17.

¹⁰ U.S., Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Bureau of Public Roads, *Highway Statistics/1965* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, April, 1967), p. 140.

¹¹ H. Doc. 354, pp. 92-93.

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 91-92.

¹³ Personal letter from R. B. Christensen, Assistant State Highway Engineer, Idaho State Department of Highways, February 27, 1968.

¹⁴ H. Doc. 354, p. 26.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 27-28. Engineering assumptions were made of a present serviceability index (measuring road condition and service life) of 2.5 and a thickness index (measuring surface, base, and subbase) of 1.0. These road tests were experiments conducted at Ottawa, Illinois, from 1958 to 1960, sponsored by AASHO and financed by the 48 contiguous states, Hawaii, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Bureau of Public Roads, the Automobile Manufacturers Association, the American Petroleum Institute, and the American Institute of Steel Construction. These AASHO road tests were administered and directed by the Highway Research Board of the National Academy of Sciences; some assistance was given by the Department of Defense.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 105.

¹⁷ *Summary of Size and Weight Limits and Reciprocity Authority* (Washington, D.C.: American Trucking Associations, Inc., Revised January 20, 1968).

¹⁸ H. Doc. 354, p. 22.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 58.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 58-59.

²¹ U.S. Congress, Senate, Senator Warren G. Magnuson introducing a Bill Related to Vehicle Weight and Width Limitations on the Interstate System, S. 2658, 90th Cong., 1st sess., November 15, 1967, *Congressional Record*, CXIII, 186.

²² For a full description, see James C. Nelson, *Railroad Transportation and Public Policy* (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1959), pp. 8-13.

²³ See Table 3, *supra*, p. 19.

²⁴ H. Doc. 354, p. 11.

²⁵ The amended S. 2658 provided for 34,000-lb. tandem axles rather than 36,000 lbs. and for a gross-weight formula as follows:

$$W = 500 \left(\frac{LN}{N-1} + 12N + 36 \right)$$

This formula allows 2,000 lbs. less gross weight for each combination size than did the formula in the original bill.

²⁶ "New Federal Size, Weight Limits Proposed," *Western Trucking—Motor Transportation*, XLVI, No. 12 (December, 1967), 22.

²⁷ "Motor Common Carriers Foresee Business Improvement in 1968," Regular Common Carrier Conference News, a press release (Regular Common Carrier Conference, Washington, D.C. [December, 1967]), p. 2. (Mimeographed.)

²⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹ William A. Bresnahan, "Year-end Statement," For the Press, a press release (American Trucking Associations, Inc., Washington, D.C., December 18, 1967), p. 2. (Mimeographed.)

THE "PUEBLO": HOW LONG,
MR. PRESIDENT?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 184th day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

AN ADMINISTRATIVE DEFICIENCY
THREATENS ECONOMY OF TIM-
BER-BASED COMMUNITIES

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1968

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to correct an administrative deficiency that threatens the economy of many timber-based communities in the West and the livelihood of thousands of people dependent upon the wise use of public timber resources for their employment.

This situation has come about because of the extraordinary demands of the Japanese economy for wood and fiber. This demand has driven the market on wood products in Japan to heights undreamed of in this country. While it would appear to be a very attractive market for manufactured lumber and wood products from the Pacific Northwest, the fact is that the market for finished products has been effectively closed off to U.S. producers, and the Japanese have instead injected themselves into our competitive log market for raw materials that are ultimately processed in Japan. The value of the end product in Japan makes it possible for exporters to bid far beyond what our domestic lumber market will allow for the cost of raw materials.

In a situation where the parity between log resources and domestic plant capacity is rapidly shifting to a position of chronic shortage, this has placed an impossible burden upon timber industries dependent upon public timber for their supply. Prices for logs are being bid up, and the supply for domestic manufacture has been further reduced.

The drain of resources from the Pacific Northwest is aggravated by the fact that every other area in the North Pacific rim, including Canada, Alaska, and Japan itself, have strict regulations to prevent the export of timber resources vital for domestic use. In April of this year, the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior recognized the growing pressures on Pacific Northwest forests by announcing similar protection for the coastal regions of Oregon and Washington. I regret that this was done only after years of desperate effort by representatives of a damaged timber industry and through an all-out, unified demand by congressional representatives and State and local officials. It is unfortunate that the Forest Service could not foresee or even recognize what was happening in time to use the authority granted by law to alleviate the problem.

This belated action represents the piecemeal approach of Federal administrative agencies to this economic threat. The too-little, too-late restrictions on log exports have merely shifted the pressures of export buyers from one area to another. My bill would extend this protection to all public timber in the United States and would effectively prescribe the limits of log exports. It would resolve the problem for all timber-producing areas—in a fashion patterned after

what other nations do to protect their natural resources.

I think it is very regrettable that this Government has said, in effect, to American industries, "Show us that you've been hurt bad, and we will take action to fix the damage at a constant level."

It is time that the burden of proof be shifted to the Federal agencies, and that the Congress take appropriate action to see that this Nation's requirement for wood and fiber receive the attention it deserves.

With log export restrictions in effect in other countries, it is apparent that the Pacific Northwest is viewed by Japanese trading companies as a tree farm for the Japanese lumber, plywood, and paper pulp industries. From a slight beginning in 1961, log exports from the region have grown to approximately 2 billion board feet a year. As a result many sawmills went out of production, many went on single shifts, and thousands of employees were laid off. Efforts by the industry to secure a primary processing restriction on Federal logs were unsuccessful.

In 1966, the growing rate of exports became so critical that it was obvious that extraordinary action was required. Last year, a series of meetings and hearings were conducted in the region and in Washington, D.C., among spokesmen for the industry, affected labor groups, Senators, Congressmen, and administration officials to build the case for direct negotiations with the Japanese and for ultimate action to relieve the impossible pressures on log prices and supply.

A meeting with Japanese officials here in December 1967, was inconclusive.

Senator MORSE convened hearings of the Senate Small Business Subcommittee to compile the record of severe damage that was occurring in the region. The testimony presented at those hearings could leave no doubt that protection was required for all public timberlands in the Pacific Northwest. However, following a meeting in Tokyo with Japanese Government representatives and industry spokesmen, Secretary Freeman, on April 17, announced an order imposing primary processing restrictions only on Oregon and Washington forests west of the Cascade Range. This was admittedly the area of most severe economic hardship, but it nevertheless stunned those of us representing areas east of the Cascade Mountains in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana, and those from northern California—all of which were under the immediate threat of log export pressures, and some of which were already feeling the effects.

The response of the administration was clearly unacceptable to me and was an obvious and more intensive threat to the economy of inland regions. I sent a letter to Secretary Freeman asking him to extend the order to cover all public timber in the region. The letter was also signed by Senators WAYNE MORSE, MARK HATFIELD, HENRY JACKSON, WARREN MAGNUSON, LEN JORDAN, and FRANK CHURCH, by Congressmen WENDELL WYATT, EDITH GREEN, JOHN DELLENBACK, TOM FOLEY, LLOYD MEEDS, DON CLAUSEN, HAROLD JOHNSON, ARNOLD OLSEN, JAMES MCCLURE, and GEORGE HANSEN.

In reply to this letter, Secretary Freeman offered to arrange a meeting between Forest Service Chief Ed Cliff and the concerned Members of Congress. I attended this meeting in the hopes that a full and open discussion of the problem might open the door to an acceptable course of action. I was disappointed.

Because of the continuing gap in communications between administration officials and those of us who are concerned with the problems of local communities and individuals dependent upon public timber, I asked Chief Cliff for an explanation of the precise conditions under which he would act to extend the primary processing order. I specifically asked for information about the procedure the Forest Service is using to identify bidders for export at public timber sales, and also what actions the Forest Service would take when their criteria for economic damage were met. I would like to submit his reply for the Record at this point:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,

Washington, D.C., July 17, 1968.

HON. AL ULLMAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ULLMAN: This responds to your letter of June 20 concerning criteria the Forest Service would expect to use in determining at what point to recommend to Secretary Freeman and, in turn, to the other concerned Departments the extension to other parts of the Northwest of the requirement for domestic processing of timber cut from the National Forests in that part of the country.

Mr. Edward Cliff told the meeting on June 19 it clearly is undesirable to wait until the forest industry in the other areas has been significantly hurt before making recommendations. Secretary Freeman has publicly stated that he stands ready to consider the facts that are relevant to a decision whether to extend the area covered by the domestic manufacture requirement.

Specific criteria, if such were to be developed for general concurrence within the Government, would need to express some way to assess impacts on at least the following, singly or in combination:

1. The prospects of domestic sawmills or plywood mills being partially or completely shut down because of logs being unavailable for processing.

2. The prospects of domestic sawmills or plywood mills being placed in a serious cost-price squeeze because of increased cost of logs from National Forests traceable to activities of purchasers for non-domestic manufacture.

3. The prospects that these or other conditions of threatened injury to the domestic forest industry are likely to occur at more than isolated locations within a major part of the Region and are likely to be of more than incidental or passing occurrence.

4. The prospect of some significant new shift in the economics of log harvest and transport which would change the previously existing economics of log harvest and transport in a major part of a Region.

5. The prospects of crippling a viable domestic forest products industry essential to proper management of the National Forests.

Internally within the Forest Service, we believe these are the factors we should take into consideration, and which we are following closely in the National Forest areas involved. There necessarily is some judgment in the way such criteria would be used and combined. Some species of logs are lower in domestic demand than others, and this varies from one part of the west to another.

There are some bona fide insect control needs that could be benefited by increased rates of harvest in specific localities.

We are now attempting to keep informed of the plans of bidders. By means of such interviews, we think it will be feasible to keep in touch with the developing situation rather than waiting until statistics are available after the fact.

When we laid our disagreements before the Japanese at the meeting of last December concerning the situation in the Douglas-fir region of western Washington and western Oregon, we estimated for that area that the average stumpage price of hemlock and other white woods had increased by about \$10 per thousand since 1961 due in part to the competition of the export market. Similarly, Douglas-fir increased by about \$14. The figure of 350 million board feet which is now exempted from the domestic processing requirement in that area represents about 9 percent of the National Forest allowable cut for the year 1967, and about 5 percent of the cut for the Bureau of Land Management administered lands in western Oregon. In our opinion, these are more than top limits. These are figures that are beyond the limits that should be considered as outside guidelines for the other major producing areas. We think a volume impact averaging as high as 5 percent, depending on species, would be a real danger signal. So would the amount of price increase, that would probably go with such a volume impact.

It also seems to us that in the event of a recommendation to extend the area covered by the requirement for domestic processing, there should be included as part of it some additional volume that would be exempt from the requirement for domestic processing, such as 5 percent of the programmed sales of each working circle to be assigned in the species and sizes that best suit export needs.

We are intensifying the system of reporting on softwood log and lumber exports and will be preparing monthly summaries of the most relevant information in addition to the quarterly summaries that have been prepared for some years now.

To answer the specific questions in your letter:

1. We are obtaining from field offices current information on bidding.
2. We have tried to explain our response to this question in the first part of this letter.
3. We have interviewed bidders and expect to continue doing so. We know of no other way to try to obtain advance information about what National Forest timber is likely to go into the export "pipeline."
4. We will keep the Secretary of Agriculture currently informed as often as there are specific facts on which to base information. We feel a very keen sense of obligation to try to interpret such information properly and to present to the Secretary, and to other Departments, the problems the forest industry faces in dealing with the pressures resulting from the export market.

Sincerely yours,

A. W. GREELEY,
Associate Chief, Forest Service.

The only conclusion I can draw from this letter, Mr. Speaker, is that the people of the Northwest are expected by their Government to pay a price of 5 percent of their most valuable natural resource to secure a degree of protection to which they are already entitled by law and by custom. And let me remind you that it would be a price exacted not once, but over and over for each and every year that such a disastrous policy remains in effect. It is totally unacceptable, and it is an affront to the people of a region already suffering from the burden of opposition, procrastination, and mis-

representation by an agency of the Federal Government. Such a policy of extortion must not be permitted.

Early this month, a meeting with Secretary Freeman for the purpose of presenting actual evidence of Japanese export interest and activity in inland and northern California regions was held. The response was unacceptable to those of us who believe that the Department has a responsibility under law to protect the economy of timber-dependent communities.

Last week, Senator MORSE resumed hearings of his subcommittee for the purpose of making this record unmistakably clear, although it is a record that is readily available and well known by the Forest Service. Testimony was heard from industry delegations led personally by the Governors of Idaho and Oregon and by a representative of the Governor of Montana.

Mr. Speaker, the evidence is obvious. The reluctance of the administrative agencies to take appropriate action under existing authority is also obvious. I think it is incumbent upon us to establish guidelines that will not permit the continued disregard of vital domestic interests. The bill I have introduced will assure that objective.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I want to express my full support for the amendment offered by Senator MORSE to the foreign aid authorization bill and which has been approved by the Foreign Relations Committee. I hope it is approved by the Senate. It would accomplish essentially the same purpose as my bill. In fact, it is also being introduced today by some of my colleagues from the Pacific Northwest who are concerned with this problem. I join in their support for the Morse amendment, as they have joined me in sponsoring this bill today.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in the House in once again observing Captive Nations Week.

The 10th anniversary of this occasion gives us a fitting opportunity to once more reassure those who still look to the free world for hope and encouragement that we here in the United States have not forgotten their dream of freedom—that we have not abandoned our fight for the right of independence for all nations.

During the 89th Congress, I wholeheartedly supported House Concurrent Resolution 416 which urged the President to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and other appropriate international forums to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of the Baltic States and to seek restoration of these rights. Let me take this opportunity to reaffirm my support of this objective. In so doing, I know I speak for many in my own State of

Illinois whose ancestral homeland is in one of the captive nations and who continue to pray that liberty will soon be restored to these gallant and long-suffering people. I know, too, that I speak for many Americans of all nationalities who share this same dream.

AN EXCELLENT STATEMENT ON AFRICA

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1968

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I recommend to every Member of the House the following observations, on Africa, from the July 21 Washington Post, by Ross K. Baker, a former research associate at the Brookings Institution and now an assistant political science professor at Rutgers:

OUR TWISTED CONCEPTION OF AFRICA

Africa lends itself to superlatives. It is the rare scholar who has not superimposed the map of the Congo on Europe and marveled at the fact that the distance between Kinshasa and Bukavu is greater than the distance between Madrid and Munich. There is also a fascination in the number of tribes or the number of dialects, or the height of mountains and the breadth of desert.

This type of exercise merely adds to the hazy and distorted picture most Americans have of Africa. Raised on a diet of Tarzan (or his TV incarnation "Ramar of the Jungle"), most Americans simply refuse to take Africa seriously. The national leaders have bizarre and exotic names which lend themselves to caricature. The violence which attended and followed independence is regarded by the casual observer as an update of savages in loincloths battling in an old Stewart Granger movie on the late show. Africa is unreal for these people.

There is another group of Americans for whom Africa is also unreal. These are the "Old Africa hands"—the missionaries and the Foreign Service officers whose perceptions are less fanciful but nonetheless distorted. For these people, Africa's importance is in direct relationship to the extent that Africans emulate Europe.

To the adherents of this school, the only Africans of any consequences are the products of Oxford, the Sorbonne or Louvain. These are the "civilized men" to whom Cecil Rhodes would have accorded equal rights. In the former French colonies, they are the évolués (the "evolved ones").

Implicit in the formulations of this group is that the colonial period was, on balance, a beneficial thing and that it provided the necessary preconditions for modernization. The corollary to this is that any African state denied the advantages of colonial dependency is inhibited in its modernization process.

Ethiopia and Liberia alone had no sustained period of colonial rule, and since both states remain relatively retarded in their economic and political growth, there appears, according to this analysis, a prima facie case for the benefits of colonialism. The past agonies of the Congo and the present travail of Nigeria—states which endured long periods of colonial rule—appear not to nullify this conviction.

ENFORCED MELTING POT

There is yet another group of observers and experts. These are the proponents of "theories of integration" which hold that

despite the relative arbitrariness of colonial border drawing which divided ethnic groups out of ignorance, convenience or ease of exploitation, Africans should create viable nations out of hopelessly heterogeneous territories.

This group, composed mainly of modern social scientists, by implication condones the authoritarian regimes required to hold these divergent groups together in something approaching a nation-state. The probability exists, however, that only a handful of the presently constituted African states will be exempt from the tensions and violence which this enforced melting pot entails.

There is yet another group of Americans who, from the perspective of their own self-interest, should have a clearer picture of Africa than they do. These are the Senators and Congressmen who are normally sensitive to the power of bloc voting and whose pilgrimages to Rome, Dublin, Tel Aviv and Warsaw in quest of the so-called "nationality vote" are part of American political folklore. Yet according to a speech by Sen. Edward M. Brooke of Massachusetts, only 2 per cent of the travel budget of legislators is spent for trips to Africa.

Africa is the ancestral homeland of 22 million Americans and a visit there might be both instructive and politically profitable. Yet the only legislators who evince consistent interest in Africa are those Senators and Representatives who serve on committees that deal directly with it or who happen to be Negro. It would be difficult to sustain the argument that the only lawmakers to visit Rome are Italian-Americans.

Africa is an area of major concern for the black people of America. They wish to re-establish a relationship with a culture that was once theirs. Perhaps their picture of Africa is somewhat idealized, but of all American observers, they alone are entitled to romanticize.

A FORM OF RACISM

All the other schools of thought about Africa are victims of a pernicious form of ethnocentrism—looking at unfamiliar societies with Western perspectives and attributing to them the same problems and potentialities that prevail in Western cultures. There is a subtle form of racism at work here. It shows up in the belief that the struggles and rivalries in Africa are somehow less noble and less important than those which prevailed in Europe at a comparable level of development.

One hears a great deal about "tribalism" or "ethnic particularism"—forces which tend to tear apart the African state whose borders were drawn by Europeans. Why is the battle for independence of the Ibo people in eastern Nigeria regarded as tribalism and the assertion of Czechoslovakian autonomy characterized as "nationalism"? Is the emergent movement of black men in southern Sudan against the Arab north any less consequential or high-minded than the historical struggle of the Poles against Russian domination?

Europe created Africa in its own image. In the heyday of dynastic politics, polyglot empires and multinational kingdoms, the European boundary-drawers believed that what was good for Austria-Hungary must surely be acceptable to the Congo. What we see in Africa today is the consequence of the European's perception of his own political and cultural superiority—the tropical empire.

The British, French and Belgians left behind empires and designated or accepted black men to preside over them. The Europeans departed content in the knowledge that Nigerian, Congolese or Ugandan nationalism was a reality. For a brief time, the Africans themselves believed this, and a fortunate few still do—and can.

It rapidly became clear, however, that after the European soldiers and police who had imposed a century of artificial serenity on

Africa had departed, most of the empires born of European fantasy were fragile illusions. The Africans were left to pick up the pieces and Africa must now sort itself out.

Whether or not Biafra as an Ibo homeland can emerge out of the ramshackle federation of Nigeria, or whether Eritrea can become independent of Ethiopia, are important only as straws in the wind. Africa will see more secessions, autonomy struggles and ethnic independence movements before its borders are again secured.

A MASK FOR DEPENDENCE

There are other unresolved issues left over from the colonial period. The principal one is what should be the relationship between the former colony and the former colonial power. At the end of the first decade of independence, most African states have chosen to retain some form of economic, political or military affiliation with the old metropolitan powers.

In some cases, these are arrangements of convenience or necessity based on perceived mutual interest. In others, independence remains a mask for an African state's total dependency on the former colonial power.

In Gabon, Senegal and the Ivory Coast, the French presence in all sectors except upper-level government posts is as great or greater than during the colonial period. In countless enterprises from banking houses to construction teams, an African fulfills the function of "front man" for a European in whom real decision-making power is vested.

Those African chiefs of state like President Senghor of Senegal and President Houphouët-Boigny of the Ivory Coast who encourage or tolerate large-scale European involvement are designated as "pragmatic" leaders. The argument runs that long-term benefits are to be gained by association with France in terms of the number of Africans trained, physical modernization and economic stability.

In return for European benefits, however, the African state must pay the cost in currency controls, foreign supervision of business and factories, import-export restrictions and, ultimately, self-respect. The Europeans and the pragmatists answer that unless there is significant involvement by expatriate talent and resources, the African states are doomed to falling income, industrial and agricultural retardation and political unrest.

Guinea, which alone of the former French colonies rejected massive French aid, has experienced all of these setbacks and is now seeking affiliation with the franc zone and significant overseas assistance. Guinea's experience is cited as proof that African states cannot progress without massive foreign investment. Perhaps this is true, but one is compelled to ask why the sources of foreign assistance and involvement must be incompatible with African self-esteem.

It is true that Africans are being trained, but the amount of real decision-making vested in Africans in European-owned companies is limited. In the crucial sector of middle-level supervisory personnel, the European is dominant. Africa is the temporary home for hundreds of thousands of overseas Europeans whose subsidized security would disappear if the Africans under their tutelage really obtained the training that was required for national development.

One might be inclined to ask why the African leaders do not go elsewhere for assistance rather than rely on the former colonial power. U.S. economic and technical assistance, with the exception of the Peace Corps, is in a process of retrenchment due to the imbalance of payments and an intensifying drive to limit foreign commitments. There is always the USSR, whose promises have invariably exceeded its ability to deliver, and China, whose resources simply do not allow a broad aid-coverage in Africa. But the presence of large numbers of Chinese and Russian causes an

uncomfortable feeling in all but the most radical African leaders.

Is Africa, then, to be left alone to settle its unresolved problems of nationality and to cope with its quest for modernization? What, moreover, should be the policy of the U.S. Government toward Africa? What kind of influence can we hope to exert and what developments should we encourage?

There is very little that the United States can do to rectify boundaries, mollify antagonistic nationalisms or mediate in civil wars. This is the task of the Africans themselves. The United States quite rightly decided against involvement in the Nigerian civil war. The Soviet Union openly sided with the federal forces against secessionist Biafra and was chastised in other parts of Africa.

In those disputes which are not purely internal, such as the mercenary activities in the Congo, the United States would do well to follow the precedent it set last summer when it sent three Air Force transports to provide logistical support to the Congolese army against the mercenaries. It was a splendid symbolic act in which the United States placed itself squarely on the side of an African government in its attempt to rid itself of a disruptive alien army. Despite congressional fears that the dispatch of these planes was a prelude to a Vietnam-style commitment, the planes were withdrawn, the Congolese were appreciative and the United States looked like a friend.

In the refusal to send the aircraft carrier Franklin D. Roosevelt to Capetown, we symbolized our unwillingness to confer the prestige of the United States on a government whose racial policies are anathema to black Africans, whose friendship, in both the long and short run, is more important to us than the amity of the Republic of South Africa. It is rare that a country in the conduct of its foreign policy can uphold its own noblest professions.

A PRACTICAL CONTRIBUTION

Beyond the provision of psychic support, what can the United States do to help Africa sort out its problems? If we are willing to commit resources, we should initiate a vast program of technical assistance by tripling the number of Peace Corps volunteers and AID personnel in the field.

This is a form of person-to-person assistance that will benefit Africans regardless of the political structures which emerge.

Understanding from the American people and a reluctance to condemn or ridicule struggling Africans is what individuals can do. The confusing list of new states which perplexes Americans will probably become even more complex as new republics split away from old ones. The military coups, counter-coups, ethnic warfare and secessions will continue as long as African states resemble multinational empires rather than nation-states. Given the heterogeneity of these states, it is a tribute to African leadership that so few of them have gone the way of Nigeria and Sudan.

African states are not melting pots like America, in which immigrants are cut off from old institutions and beliefs and diluted by a new culture. The traditional beliefs which form ethnic affinity reside within the state itself. Even the migration to the cities in Africa has resulted in transportation of the village cultures rather than a rejection of them. The primordial village lies just "up-country" and the African periodically renews these ancient ties. Urbanization is not necessarily a precursor of nation-building in the ethnically heterogeneous state.

The conflicting pressures of ethnicity, the generation-gap, the paucity of resources, the irrational economic arrangements confound even those African leaders whose appeals are broadly based. Unable to process conflicting or excessive demands, the ruling elite adopts a self-serving philosophy which holds that

if mass improvement is not feasible, self-enrichment is. This attitude was characteristic of the latter years of Ghana's Nkrumah regime.

One may draw from this an image of unmitigated despair, but Africa has a great deal going for it. There is great strength in the African kinship system: the extended family in which several generations live under one roof and care for each other; the obligations to one's relatives which decrees that if one family member "makes it," he helps out the others. The land-tenure system insures that no man is without a plot to farm because land is held in common by the village.

The traditional human institutions of Africa are what gives this continent its strength, not the European facades and accretions which we magnify in order to make the Africans seem "more like us." Africans will borrow from us what they feel is worthwhile or useful—our skills, our technology and our highest principals. We should not expect them to adopt capitalism or American-style democracy. The political problems of Africa are susceptible of African solutions only.

MY SON, DEAD IN VAIN

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, how can any man answer such anguish by a mother over the brutal murder of her soldier son in the service of our country?

But Congress can use its power and its voice to assure all mothers that such a loss is not in vain.

How can any thinking, loyal American, breathing the free air through the sacrifice of our young men, applaud Communist dignitaries, or affront the memory of our heroes by attending collaboration meetings such as the interchange of Soviet-United States airlines, or the installation of Communist consuls?

Any person who could participate in such demoralizing activity while our loyal sons give their lives for our liberty is unworthy of the cause for which our countrymen fight. I fear such collaboration will cost the needless slaughter of even more of our best before we awaken to the true threat that America's danger is not as much from Communists as from our own leaders. Leaders who do not understand communism or if knowledgeable of the danger are afraid to act. How long? How long?

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, a letter from a mother, Mrs. Bessie Crickenberger, of Lynchburg, Va., addressed to me, her letter to the Lynchburg News, and an editorial from the News, along with reports in a magazine with nationwide circulation on the United States-U.S.S.R. airline exchange follows:

JULY 20, 1968.

HON. JOHN R. RARICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

HON. CONGRESSMAN RARICK: This letter was published exactly as I wrote it to the newspaper. This is exactly as I and so many other mothers feel.

This boy graduated from high school in June of 1967. The draft was waiting for him, so he had to sign up for some branch of service.

These young boys have to die fighting communism in Asia. Then we see in the newspapers articles about the Communists being tolerated here in the United States, and even that jet flights have been started between the U.S. and Russia, and Soviet Dignitaries are feted in this country.

It is a national disgrace and absolute treason against our military men to allow this trade to go on with a country that supplies weapons to our enemy.

Respectfully,

Mrs. BESSIE TREVEY CRICKENBERGER.
LYNCHBURG, VA.

LETTERS TO THE FORUM: "MY SON DIED IN VAIN"

To the EDITOR OF THE NEWS:

SIR: On May 26th, my son Marine PFC Richard W. Crickenberger was killed in Vietnam. "Dicky" was a mine specialist with a road sweep-team, and he was killed by mortar as they entered Khe Sanh. Killed at Khe Sanh, where the ground is indelibly stained with the blood of our boys. Now, our "brave" government decides to abandon Khe Sanh, as not worth the effort.

Last week a Marine Captain presented Dicky's young wife with his medals; but there should have been another medal, one stating: "Our Hero, but he died in vain, a victim of our own Congressional stupidity." Our government is not supporting our military men. If this so-called "police-action" were left entirely to the military leaders, and they were turned loose to really fight, this war would have been over long ago. But their hands are tied by the President and his "advisors." How many of those "advisors" have Communist tendencies?

Our asinine President allows the military to bomb far north of the DMZ, but by-passing or using only small bombs on the area ten miles wide just north of the DMZ. That area is where the North Vietnamese are massed; that area the North Vietnamese have to pass through. That area is where the North Vietnamese sit with their mortars and shell our boys incessantly day and night. Our boys are "sitting-ducks" for the VC mortar, and can only try to find trenches in which to wait it out. Why does not our President allow our military to use small atomic bombs, and blast that area off the face of the earth? In the smallest hamlet in this United States, the sheriff would have the courage to go after a bunch of gangsters terrorizing his town; but our Congressional leaders will not let our men go into North Vietnam after those yellow devils.

How many of the Viet Cong weapons have come from "neutral" countries? And how many were made from materials shipped to those countries by big American companies? So long as our government allows trade with these countries, our government is indirectly slaughtering our very own men. Any friend of Hanoi is our enemy. Why does not Congress cut off all trade and loans of any kind to these "neutral" countries? Are the big American traders putting on political pressure?

In mid-April, Dicky sent home a picture of a Russian-made mine which he uncovered along Highway 9 to Khe Sanh. A Russian mine waiting for our men in Vietnam. Yet, we are friendly with Russia? England, our supposed ally, still trades with Hanoi. These are "neutral" countries?

Unless Congress cuts off all trade whatsoever to any country that deals with Hanoi, I can only believe that this "police-action" is kept going purely for economical and political reasons. Are our boys being slowly "fed" to the Viet Cong? Extermination for economy? Or, are our Congressmen and our President just gutless cowards? Is that why they

do nothing about the admitted Communists in this country? Are they afraid to arrest these Communists and try them as traitors? Why are we not fighting Communism in this, our own country?

Our flag no longer represents freedom. It represents the tyranny in Washington; the tyranny of a draft that condemns our boys to death in Vietnam before they are old enough to vote. The colors of the flag have changed altogether in their meaning. The red is for our sons' blood spilling out on foreign soils to fulfill our "commitments." The white is for the cowardly flag of truce which our President is waving in front of Communism. The blue is for the sadness and heartbreak of the mothers and widows left behind.

Our country has the weapons and the military men to win this "controlled" war. Why have we not been able to take over a country smaller than some of our States? Why? Because our Congressional leaders will not turn our men loose to win! Is this "war" actually "extermination for economy"? Or, are our "Great Society" leaders just gutless cowards? Which?

BESSIE T. CRICKENBERGER.

(A heartbroken mother and one filled with utter contempt for the "Demo-Commie" tyrants in Washington.)

LYNCHBURG.

[From the Lynchburg (Va.) News, July 14, 1968]

SOME QUESTIONS RAISED

The lead letter in today's Forum on this page poses some questions to the President, and to Congress, about the policy prevailing in the Vietnam War. It is a poignant letter, and one which untold thousands, even millions, of American citizens would strongly support. The reason for it is that under prevailing policy the dead and wounded Americans in this war are considered needless sacrifices, for they represent a force in uniform on foreign soil committed to battle and privation and sacrifice in a war they are not supposed to win.

The same situation existed in the war in Korea, which continues as an armistice with frequent forays by the enemy and their apparent intention of not having given up and continued intent to take over South Korea. A major war without determination to victory imposes sacrifice on only a part of the people. In a war to which the entire country is committed with the determined objective of victory, everybody is involved, the risk potential is shared as a nation, and loss of a family member is part of a national sorrow.

When we all share, each one can better accept loss.

The News is pleased that this letter was written and that we are able to publish it.

[From Life magazine, July 26, 1968]

AEROFLOT OUT TO MAKE THE GOING GREATEST

It took the Soviets only one flying day to modify an image which seasoned travelers had expected would keep Aeroflot jets half empty on flights across the Atlantic. The image was of indifferent or nonexistent service. For the inaugural trip to the U.S., the Russians picked a crack crew which included Meritorious Flier of the U.S.S.R. Boris Yegorov as captain and Hero of Socialist Labor Aleksandr Vitkovsky as copilot. They also picked the prettiest and most efficient Aeroflot stewardesses—"the sort," one American reporter traveling on the plane wrote, "who have vanished from most U.S. airlines: smiling kids interested in passengers." The stewardesses poured tea for the queasy, vodka for the venturesome. The button-sewing was quick, and there was caviar and pressed chicken. At journey's end the 97 aboard (including 53 Soviet VIPs and 44 paying passengers, nine of the Americans) had congratulations for Aeroflot. In return the airline

promised that any child born on any flight would get one Aeroflot ticket free every year of his life.

The first Soviet IL-62 to arrive in New York was met by a diverse band of dignitaries, as were the two Pan Am Boeings in Moscow. In New York were Najeeb Halaby, president of Pan Am; Jacob Malik, Soviet Ambassador to the U.N.; Aeroflot's A. V. Bessedin; Eugene Rostow, U.S. Under Secretary of State. In Moscow: General Boris Bugayev, Deputy Minister of Civil Aviation and official greeter; Pan Am Chairman Harold Gray, and Llewellyn Thompson, U.S. Ambassador to Moscow.

There was human drama of a high order with the arrival of the Aeroflot jet in New York. Shmul Poberebinsky, 65, who lives in Tashkent, was met by his brother, Samuel Bensky, 80, of Hillside, N.J. They have not seen each other since 1920. Until 1964 Bensky believed his brother had been killed during World War II.

At take-off in Moscow the Aeroflot pilots and stewardesses had a lot to smile about: after 10 years of negotiations stalled by cold war flare-ups, direct U.S.-U.S.S.R. air service was about to become a reality. There was one in-flight problem, and what U.S. traveler could not have foreseen it? Thirteen hours and 5,000 miles out from Moscow, the Ilyushin jet flew 95 minutes in New York air traffic before getting clearance to land. Later two Pan Am jets left for Moscow to carry out the U.S. half of the exchange.

Over the Atlantic, Yegorov dropped back to discuss progress with Russian travelers including Aeroflot executive Vladimir Vasilyev. Copilot Vitovsky took over the controls. Stewardesses like Vera Alimochkima were kept busy pinpointing the Ilyushin 62's location on a flight map for passengers.

Approaching New York, Captain Yegorov, 43, showed fatigue. Concerning the delay caused by air traffic congestion, he said later, "In Moscow everything is on time." At Montreal the plane picked up FAA representative Matthew Warren who guided Yegorov through U.S. traffic patterns.

CHALLENGE TO THE WEST FOR GLOBAL BUSINESS

Aeroflot advertisements boast that the airline is the world's largest carrier. Measured by route miles flown in 1967 (350,000) and passengers flown (55.1 million), the claim stands up. Flight SU 03 made the U.S. the 46th foreign country to be served by Aeroflot, which already flies to nearly all European capitals as well as to Peking and Cairo. Clearly the Soviets have set out to compete all over the world, matching the best that Americans and Europeans have to offer.

The reciprocal agreement between Aeroflot and Pan American starts with only one round trip a week for each carrier. (For the time being Aeroflot will stop in Montreal and Pan American in Copenhagen to pick up and discharge passengers.) With the New York link established, Aeroflot expects soon to be a genuine round-the-world line like Pan Am and BOAC and, in particular, challenge U.S. domination of Pacific routes to Tokyo. Aleksandr V. Bessedin, the amiable chief of international air services in the Soviet Ministry of Civil Aviation (which is Aeroflot), laid it on the line: "We want tourists, and we expect to carry about 50,000 a year from the U.S. within a few years. We expect to carry 65 million passengers in 1968, and that's about one quarter of all the people who will fly in the world this year."

Aside from political troubles, the opening of direct Moscow-New York service may have been delayed because the Russians wanted to have their own aircraft which could compete in comfort and speed with Western jet liners. The Ilyushin 18 medium-range turboprop, workhorse of Eastern Europe's airports, was not good enough, but the IL-62 is. Passengers on the New York flight found that the seats

were wider and more comfortable than on Western jets, and the location of the four engines in the rear (after the fashion of the British VC-10) made for a quieter ride.

Indeed the IL-62 seems to indicate the end of Aeroflot's dependence on military hand-me-downs. Aeroflot has had jet service since 1955, but the planes were all modified bombers with uneconomically high rates of fuel consumption. No foreign airline wanted to buy them, and until recently the Russians did not appear to care much about selling them. It is different now. As in so many areas of the changing Soviet economy, Aeroflot's managers are deadly serious about making money; they have already leased one of their proud new IL-62s to Air France. They expect to have their own supersonic jet in operation by 1970 or 1971, about the time the Anglo-French Concorde goes into service, and well ahead of the U.S. supersonic timetable. They are prepared to offer that plane on tempting terms to foreign carriers (e.g., Pakistani International), thus biting into a market dominated by Western manufacturers.

JERRY HANNIFIN.

INDUSTRY PILOTS SCHOOL FOR JOBLESS

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1968

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, it is hard for us to imagine a person supporting a family on less than \$100 a month in welfare money. It is hard to imagine but it does happen—right here in America.

A recent article in the Christian Science Monitor focuses a workable approach to help the hard-core unemployed stand on their own two feet in the job world and earn a decent wage, which is the right of every American.

This article features a pilot program in Houston, Tex., which shows how American business and government are cooperating to help the hard-core unemployed become productive citizens.

Under this program funded by the U.S. Department of Labor, private business recruited 450 of the hard-core jobless for training and, 12 months later, 300 of them have been placed in jobs.

The results of this project illustrate most clearly how business and government can work effectively together to solve the problems of serious disadvantage that plague so many of our fellow citizens.

And these results—coupled with results coming in from across the country—indicate that the goal of the new JOBS program to hire and train 500,000 of the hard-core unemployed will be achieved.

I think my distinguished colleagues will benefit from the encouraging evidence in this article. I, therefore, include the July 2, 1968, Christian Science Monitor feature in the RECORD, as follows:

INDUSTRY PILOTS SCHOOL FOR JOBLESS

(NOTE.—Business and staff writers of The Christian Science Monitor have taken a hard look at the throes of American business as it tackles the problem of employing those who don't meet minimum hiring standards. This article introduces a new series on hiring the hard-core jobless.)

(By Richard A. Nenneman)

BOSTON.—"We took down the mathematics sign; they had all failed in math."

"We put up one that said measurement; everyone wants to be able to measure."

Partly because he turned a lot of advice upside down and acted according to his own understanding of human nature, John Donley has just finished, well ahead of schedule, a pilot program in training hard-core unemployed people in Houston.

"They told us to be gentle with these people," he says, "because society had been hard on them. They even suggested we pick them up if necessary to get them to school. Instead, I spent the first day explaining the Houston bus schedules and then told them if anyone missed more than three days [of the eight-week course] he would be out." There was hardly a drop-out among the entire 450 men and women.

Mr. Donley was talking about a pilot Manpower Administration program of the Labor Department in which private companies were given contracts in 10 different cities to train the hard-core unemployed. His project is one of so many different programs today that only the experts can keep track of them all.

ASSIGNMENTS ASKED

Northern Natural Gas Company asked for assignments in three cities—Houston, Detroit, and Los Angeles—and got all three. Mr. Donley, who at that time was director of the United States Commerce Department office in Pittsburgh, went with a Northern subsidiary, Northern Systems, to take on the Houston training job.

His task was to train 450 people over an 18-month period and get two-thirds of them placed in jobs. Twelve months later he has finished the training and already has placed more than 300 (39 percent were male, and all of these have been placed). The group was 72 percent Afro-American and 17 percent Mexican-American.

The eight-week program included grounding in English, in basic mathematics, in tool familiarity, and attention to the social skills. Simple things were covered such as how to get along with other people and learning not to panic if asked to take a written test.

The result, says Mr. Donley, is that a group of people, who before the program were drawing less than \$100 a month from a combination of welfare programs, have now moved up to an average wage of \$281. Moreover, he is satisfied that they have been placed in jobs where they will have the opportunity to continue learning and to advance.

BREAKTHROUGH ACHIEVED

Among other things, he scored a breakthrough in getting women hired as utility meter readers in the Houston area.

Mr. Donley was asked why the program had worked so well. He thinks it was largely a matter of the relationship between the teachers and the jobless. The responsibility was put on the unemployed individual to find his own job.

"We never told a new student we would find him a job. We said, 'We'll help train you. We'll open some doors for you.' But the worker remained the job seeker, and he knew it."

Thus, little things like the bus schedule were stressed, not to be hard on people, but to open up each person's sense of responsibility for himself.

Mr. Donley had realized that finding a job for a man would not in the long run be as important as finding what motivated him—in learning how to "turn him on."

Some of the nuances in this pilot program could be important for others to hear about. For in this summer 1968, as American business gets involved in a big way for the first time with the problem of the hard-core unemployed, everyone is looking for the best technique.

CHALLENGE ACCEPTED

Americans have, by and large, accepted a new challenge. Together they grope for the best answers to it.

Some conclusions of this series of articles are:

Big business is definitely in business to solve the hard-core unemployment problem. Smaller businesses will increasingly be joining in, too.

Business still lacks sufficient ground rules as to the extent or direction of its involvement. Not long ago, any corporate activity that didn't contribute directly to profits was suspect. Now business is asked to go full speed ahead.

But profits cannot be neglected. The largest corporations can look on some of their ghetto involvement as corporate giving. Even that has its limits. And smaller companies can do little hard-core work at net cost to themselves.

Huge sums of money are going to be needed to solve the hard-core problem. Much of this will probably have to come from the government, either through outright training subsidies or in the form of tax incentives.

VIEWPOINT SUGGESTED

The most hopeful way to look on the 1967-68 period is that it has been a tooling up for the massive work to be done from now until 1971, if 500,000 hard-core jobless are to become usefully employed.

Various programs will need to be compared, on the basis of relative costs and relative effectiveness. What about prejob training such as the Houston program, compared with on-the-job training? Or what about ghetto plants, as opposed to providing transport for ghetto residents to major suburban industrial areas, as has just been started in Boston?

Whites need to become more sensitive to black attitudes. They are training blacks in two ways: to gain particular job skills and to work with others for the first time in large industrial situations. Working with others, for instance, involves the demands of a production line. These demands are neither white nor black.

But black men used to be approached in a way that takes into account their particular background. Many a migrant from the South, for example, has never been in a factory and knows nothing of the importance of punctuality to a mass operation.

RESERVATIONS INDICATED

While corporations are quite willing to talk about their hard-core involvement, (1) they are not entirely sure themselves of the effectiveness of all they are doing, and (2) some are concerned about the black reaction if their particular programs don't work out well.

If it is admitted the United States is still in a "tooling up" phase, there is a need to examine present programs for their deficiencies as well as their strong points.

Some black leaders are concerned that too much attention is being given to labor-intensive jobs, in which the need for so many workers will diminish in a few years.

Says Ralph Hoagland, a white discount-store executive working full time in various ghetto programs in Boston, "I ask corporations if they are training the hard-core so they have a chance to make \$7,500 within two years. If they aren't, they're wasting their time."

OPPORTUNITY DEMANDED

Anyone who talks with the black community knows this is not an extreme statement. Blacks are demanding full opportunity to achieve job equality. Hard-core programs cannot stop with labor-intensive employment, they say, nor with permanent assignment to menial jobs.

Jobs aren't the whole story, of course. There is general education, better housing, nursery programs, and other community improvement. Business is involved here also.

But business is most tangibly connected with employment. Access to full and meaningful employment and an equal chance for advancement are prerequisites to welding together the broken links between the white man and the black man in America.

A "WORST BOOK OF THE YEAR" NOMINEE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are aware of the stubborn policy of the Johnson administration to embrace and coexist with the Soviet Union. Therefore, it is necessary that we maintain a proper interpretation of history so as to effectively judge the actions of the Soviet Union. Its totalitarian misrule by dictators of the Soviet empire has, unfortunately, been accepted as commonplace and its daily abuses shrugged off. Therefore, I was especially intrigued by a book review by associate editor Harry Dembowski of the Polish American in Chicago which very properly reviews Soviet policy since the bloody Bolshevik Revolution:

A "WORST BOOK OF THE YEAR" NOMINEE

(By Harry E. Dembowski)

Several days ago while browsing through some of the recent acquisitions of the Chicago Public Library, I made a surprising discovery—namely, the book "Russia Re-Examined," by someone named William Mandel—which undoubtedly deserves a place on anyone's "worst books of the year" list.

Written in a literary style apparently intended for the average American high school student and illustrated by countless pictures of smiling workers (with ne'er frown to be encountered from cover to cover), "Russia Re-Examined"—supposedly an objective examination of life in Russia since the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917—is little more than a prolonged apologia for that regime.

A few excerpts, taken almost at random, should raise the question of why the Chicago Public Library, in view of its very limited funds, ever acquired the volume in the first place.

The Soviet Union's atrocious behavior during the first months of World War II, for instance, is casually explained away with a few glib passages.

"In 1938, England and France appeased Hitler at Munich by compelling Czechoslovakia to surrender to Germany without resistance . . . The Soviet Union decided it was not going to be left holding the bag, and signed a nonaggression pact with Germany."

"Hitler launched World War II in September, 1939. Upon the collapse of the Polish government, the Red Army marched into the western Ukraine and western Belorussia, which had been in Polish possession . . . Stalin further strengthened his borders by retaking the Baltic states of Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia, as well as the territory of Bessarabia then in Rumanian possession. He also made war on Finland to push back the Finnish border from Leningrad."

Were any of these acts immoral or at least improper? What of the material aid, including oil, supplied to Hitler by Stalin during this period, at a time when German armies were overrunning Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium and France? Never a word from our "objective" author.

Russia's subsequent military efforts against Nazi Germany are glorified, neither the Katyn Forest Massacre nor the Yalta Confer-

ence ever mentioned, and Stalin's post-war expropriation of half of Europe is viewed in this extraordinary context:

"Soviet policy in Europe since the war has been protection against the possibility of a third invasion in this century across the open plains from the west. Soviet forces are maintained in Germany, in Poland along the supply line to Germany, and in Hungary. In the years immediately after the war, chiefly in 1946, the U.S.S.R. withdrew its forces from Norway, Finland, Denmark, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Iran, Manchuria and Korea."

"United States Lend-Lease aid to Russia was stopped as soon as the fighting ended. The U.S.S.R. was not given a reconstruction loan such as the United States granted to all its non-Communist allies . . . The U.S.S.R. regards these policies as the beginning of the cold war."

The U.S.S.R.'s violation of practically all of its treaty agreements with the West, its forcible imposition to totalitarian dictatorships upon the historic states of Eastern and Central Europe, Stalin's rejection of President Truman's proposal for United Nations' control of all atomic weapons—these and the other actual causes of the Cold War are never even mentioned by Mr. Mandel in his Pravda-esque parody of recent history.

One of the most disappointing chapters in Russia Re-Examined, something entitled "Party, Government, and People," reveals more about the author's own feelings than about the political system he purports to be examining.

"It is important to realize that Soviet people simply do not think about government in the same manner that Americans or Englishmen or, say, Italians, do. Every Soviet citizen is raised from childhood to regard the Party leadership as deserving the credit for his country's progress. Usually the people he respects most are among the twelve million Party members."

Yes, Mr. Mandel, fifty years of totalitarian rule can sometimes distort one's political judgment. But what is your excuse?

HEALTH CONSERVATION AND PROTECTION FOR THOSE WHO WORK

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1968

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak in behalf of the American workers who have no spokesman or protector. I am referring to those millions of American citizens who are employed in small plants and businesses which neither are unionized nor have any sort of management supported occupational safety and health programs.

They could tell you that things are not any safer or healthier on the job now than they were in the past. Take, for example, the young foundry worker described recently in Business Week—hardly a radical publication: He works in a "shadowy furnace room where nauseating zinc oxide fumes hover above roaring furnaces filled with molten brass."

The owners were aware that the workers got the "brass shakes"—metal fume fever—and "laughed about it." What they did not know was that the workers were also being exposed to excessive levels of copper and lead fumes and high concentrations of silica dust. Nor would

they have known if it had not been for an inspection by the Pennsylvania Occupational Health Department.

Small industry workers in Pennsylvania are fortunate, for the occupational health program there is one of the best in the Nation. But there are foundries in the other States where the situation is quite different. Eight States have no occupational health programs at all and others like Texas and Illinois, hardly rural in character, have one- or two-man operations.

Pittsburgh is also fortunate in having the headquarters of the Industrial Hygiene Foundation, a nonprofit organization, which has served its member companies for over 30 years in a broad spectrum of environmental health and safety matters, and who will be prepared to lend their industrial expertise and objective evaluation and research under the provisions of this legislation.

No one knows, Mr. Speaker, exactly how many of our working citizens have no management-supported programs, no union, nor State agency to protect them against health hazards on the job. But I can assure you that the number is not small and that they will continue to be exposed to the whole range of industrial hazards unless this Congress does something about the situation.

H.R. 17748, the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1968, helps fill this vital need. It provides grants to the States to help them develop or improve their occupational safety and health programs, research into the cause and prevention of occupational diseases and accidents, Federal standards to assure that workers in every State get equal protection, and training programs to make up for the existing shortage of personnel. This bill will not solve all of our problems, but it is certainly a long overdue first step in reducing the tragic toll of occupational accidents and diseases among all of our employed citizens.

I feel that the additions of the permanent advisory committee and the provisions for judicial review by the States in the bill recently reported by the committee have improved, this legislation which I am pleased to support in the interest of controlling hazards on the job, and promoting good health practices.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, during this month when we celebrate our American independence, it is entirely fitting that we also pause to remember the plight of our brothers in spirit of the captive nations of east-central Europe whose battle for freedom is not yet won. This week, all Americans, many of whom have relatives and friends among the 100 million Europeans living under Communist regimes, wish to reaffirm their strong support of and faith in these captive

peoples and the democratic principles and ideals they embrace.

This year marks the 50th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the three Baltic States of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. For the Balts, 22 years of increasing prosperity and a bright future were erased by the Russian annexations of their three countries following a violent takeover in 1940. Since that year, these Baltic peoples, along with the natives of the other east-central European countries under Soviet rule, have been forcibly held captive by an oppressive system which denies them their right of self-determination in even the most rudimentary local matters.

Millions of Americans have very personal reasons for being concerned with the plight of these captive peoples. For many, the Second World War and the subsequent Iron Curtain which divided the Eastern European people from the free Western Nations meant separations from loved ones that have now lasted over 28 years. Today, Americans of Albanian, Bulgarian, Czechoslovakian, Estonian, Hungarian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish, and Rumanian descents, have dedicated themselves to helping to speed up the liberation of their fatherlands from Soviet occupation. More importantly, the problem of the captive people of this world should concern all thinking, conscientious Americans. No man dedicated to the principles of freedom and liberty for all can ignore the dehumanized totalitarianism that exists behind the Iron Curtain. To use a well-known euphemism, "As long as one man is in bondage, is any man truly free?" As Americans with consciences, who believe in the democratic ideals as set down by our Founding Fathers in the Declaration of Independence and our Constitution, we must answer in the negative, and then lend at least our moral support to people who are struggling for the same ends which U.S. citizens achieved almost 200 years ago. This support can be demonstrated in two important ways.

First of all, by making the annual commemoration of Captive Nations Week a significant and meaningful event in which the entire country participates, we would renew the confidence of these captive people that they, too, will some day benefit by a political system such as we now enjoy based on liberty and freedom for all men.

Second, and more important, by its very existence and continued prosperity in today's modern world, the United States stands as a symbol of hope and encouragement to captive people living in Communist-controlled areas because it provides tangible evidence that government by the people has not become obsolete. Therefore, we must all work to remain an excellent example of a worthwhile, viable democracy which all oppressed people suffering under totalitarianism may strive to emulate.

Men of free spirit everywhere are inseparably intertwined in the quest of their democratic ideals. This week, we remind the people of the captive nations that we Americans are their brothers in spirit and their moral comrades as they

wage their battle against totalitarianism and the age-old foe, injustice.

Mr. Speaker, National Captive Nations Week was dramatized last Saturday in the State of Illinois when public leaders and patriotic citizens joined together to combine two themes: "150 Years of the Good Life in Illinois," and "Freedom and Independence for All Nations." My friend, Viktor Viksnins, of Chicago, general chairman of the Chicago captive nations program organized this significant observance.

I commend my friends and constituents in Illinois who participated in this successful program. I know that this program, combined with many other efforts exerted in behalf of the people of the captive nations, will provide encouragement and hopefully an early liberation of their respective countries.

EMPLOYING THE UNEMPLOYABLES

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1968

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the June issue of Supervisory Management carries an article on "Employing the Unemployables" by John D. Dewhurst, president of the Arrow Tool Co., in my own State of Connecticut.

I am proud to report that Mr. Dewhurst, with Labor Department assistance under the Manpower Development and Training Act, has for some time been hiring and successfully training men from the disadvantaged segment of our society.

In talking about the so-called hard-core unemployed, Mr. Dewhurst states:

No matter what their limitations, with proper handling they can be trained to become productive. . . . But there is a far more compelling reason for teaching a trade to the disadvantaged. . . . The social problem of teaching them to take their rightful places in a competitive world is one which we must solve.

Mr. Dewhurst's article contains much helpful advice for those now becoming involved in training the hard-core unemployed. Under unanimous consent I include the entire article, "Employing the Unemployables," in the RECORD:

EMPLOYING THE UNEMPLOYABLES

(By John D. Dewhurst)

More and more companies are concerning themselves with one of our most pressing national problems: the hard-core unemployed. As business and industry, in cooperation with government, are finding ways to successfully hire and train the "unemployables," supervisors in increasing numbers are faced with the challenge of managing them. A report on our experience at Arrow Tool may provide some helpful guidelines for supervisors.

A NEW SOURCE OF LABOR

Several years ago, we urgently needed a new source of labor for our growing business of making machined parts for the computer industry. With Labor Department assistance under the Manpower Development and Training Act, we set out to hire and train men from the group now popularly called

hard-core—men with little or no work experience, no special job skills and a limited educational background. They were rejects of a society that has been generally uninterested in salvaging them. Many of them were from minority groups seriously handicapped by discrimination. Some were alcoholics and addicts, ex-convicts and chronic drifters. Each brought with him all the personal problems that had contributed to his previous failures in the working world. To even bring these men up to the level where they could qualify for training as apprentice machinists, we had to send them to an intensive pre-apprenticeship course at a Hartford vocational school.

How do you prepare an organization to accept and work with this kind of employee—the employee who, until now, would never have been considered for a job with your company?

THE SUPERVISOR'S KEY ROLE

Whatever the size of the company and the extent of management's commitment, the supervisor will play a key role in determining the success of employing the hard-core. He should have a clear understanding of their attitudes and problems.

He should know that because little has been asked of them in life—and little given—they often lack a sense of responsibility. For many, the very process of living has been so difficult and so fraught with disappointments that they have lost faith in themselves and in those who sincerely want to help them. Many have simply stopped trying and have developed what would seem to the casual onlooker a compulsion to fail. When you hire a member of the hard-core, you can usually count on having to take these personal problems along with the task of training him.

For example, a hard-core employee may take his first paycheck and put it down on a \$1,300 hi-fi set, disregarding the fact that he can't really afford the monthly payments. This may lead to garnishment problems later.

The employee's supervisor may wonder why he doesn't realize the limitations of his income. The answer is that he's never had experience with personal budgeting—he only knows that he's always wanted a hi-fi set and can get one by simply signing on the credit merchant's dotted line.

REVAMPING COMPANY POLICY

Despite the problems they bring with them to the job, hard-core people can ultimately be of value to the companies that hire them. No matter what their limitations, with proper handling they can be trained to become productive. That's the dollars-and-cents reason for involvement.

But there is a far more compelling reason for teaching a trade to the disadvantaged. It is a reason that none of us in management can any longer afford to ignore. For in our changing society, these people have made their presence known to all of us. The social problem of teaching them to take their rightful places in a competitive world is one which we must solve.

Our policy is to give a job to any man who really wants to work. At Arrow Tool, testing is used to "select in" rather than to "select out"—to provide the training director or the foreman with knowledge of a man's weaknesses as well as his strengths.

In line with that policy, we've deliberately taken on a number of tough cases over the past few years—men who wouldn't stand a chance of making it without the individual attention we're prepared to provide.

A CASE HISTORY

Donald W. is an employee I never thought would work out. He came into the apprenticeship program after working for years at three different jobs—a total of 18 hours a day—to support his wife and seven children.

During Donald's pre-apprenticeship training, the instructor noticed that he was inattentive in class, but attributed that to the fact that he was still working nights as a cab driver to make ends meet.

After Donald started on the job, the foreman worked closely with him, trying to help him to make the grade. But the man still lacked self-confidence, and seemed uninterested in his work.

The turning point came the day we put Donald on as a substitute truck driver and found that he did the job faster and better than the regular man. Back in a job he could master, his self-confidence returned. My foreman talked with him again and concluded that Donald just wasn't meant to be a machinist.

With that information, we transferred him to the plating room. Now, less than two years later, Donald is head man in our plating department, making between \$150 and \$200 a week, including overtime. Evenings, instead of driving a cab he's taking a course at Yale University which will help to further his career.

THE SUPERVISOR'S ATTITUDE

One thing that we have learned is that the attitude of the supervisor—positive or negative—can make or break the hard-core employee. We realize that the supervisor does have a problem. We give him a man from the bottom of the employment barrel and he still has his machines to keep going, his parts to make to a quality standard. He doesn't want to see his production hurt and his materials scrapped.

To help them over the hurdle, we've given our foremen and supervisors classes in human relations, supervisory practices and communications. Thorough training is the best way to brace our foremen for the task they face.

The value of such training, particularly in the area of human relations, has been amply proved. For example, among our apprentices is a fiery-tempered young Puerto Rican. He's blown up and walked out on the job several times, but we are convinced that his talent is worth saving.

After his supervisor, Carmelo Renna, took the human relations course, he studied the young man and decided his chief problem was that he was a perfectionist and couldn't tolerate having anybody tell him he'd made a mistake. So Renna talked with his protégé, and explained that no one liked to make mistakes but that he could only learn by having his errors pointed out. The result is that the young man's attitude has improved markedly and he's well on his way to becoming one of our most valued employees.

From the practical application of his human relations training, Carmelo Renna has concluded that in working with the disadvantaged, "a supervisor has to bend more, has to choose his words carefully and use them wisely."

THE EXTRA EFFORT COUNTS

Ben Libera, foreman of our numerical control units, admits that handling the disadvantaged is sometimes difficult but he is aware that this labor market must be tapped. Says Libera, "The foreman must realize that these people have problems. Then he must study his men and handle each individually."

Louis Kolakowski, foreman of our tool room, points out that any good foreman must have the ability to motivate. It just takes a little extra motivation in working with some of the hard-core.

Kolakowski has been so successful with his last group of trainees that he managed to get them all a raise after just one month on the job. After three months, he reported proudly, "Some of them are already doing jobs that I didn't think they would be doing for the next year and a half."

Kolakowski's statement is convincing evidence that—with a little extra effort on the part of foremen and supervisors—our disadvantaged citizens can make the grade.

Many industries have taken the lead in utilization of the hard-core, and have proved the value of these employees. In shipbuilding and aircraft manufacturing, electronics and food service, as well as in the machine tool industry, disadvantaged men and women have been successfully trained in a variety of skills. Taking their places in business and industry beside workmen with better educational backgrounds, they have proved that given the opportunity—and the understanding of helpful first-line supervisors—the hard-core unemployed can become productively employed members of society.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY ACT OF 1968

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1968

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the New Republic of June 15 carried an interesting and informative article by Ralph Nader and Jerome Gordon on the subject of the occupational health and safety bill. In order that my colleagues may read this article for themselves and adjudge the nature of the bill and its opposition, I include it in the RECORD:

[From the New Republic, June 15, 1968]

SAFETY ON THE JOB

(By Ralph Nader and Jerome Gordon)

"Imagine yourself sitting in your office a few months from today. A young man barges in. You recognize him as a man you once refused to hire. He had no education and no potential you could use. His main experience consisted of cashing welfare checks. But he shows you he's now a representative of the federal government—an inspector with the Department of Labor. And he threatens to padlock your gates and have you fined \$1,000 a day if you don't do as he says."

With minor historic adjustments, the foregoing remarks could have issued from the business barons of the McKinley era. Actually, they were written two months ago by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce as a call to obstruction by U.S. business of the Johnson Administration's worker health and security bill. With a lobbying effort, in conjunction with such other major trade associations as the National Association of Manufacturers, that has led the Chamber to unfurl its true colors, there is a growing probability that Congress will not act by the end of this session. That would mean another year without a comprehensive federal program designed to end colossal inaction and penury by our society in dealing with the following conditions:

Every working day 55 workers die, 8,500 are disabled and 27,200 are injured (a case can be made that these data are under-enumerated by at least 25 percent annually.)

Unlike traumatic injuries which are relatively visible, the longer range injuries causing insidious deterioration of the human body come from exposure to coal dust, asbestos, lead, cadmium, beryllium, cotton dust, carbon monoxide, chemicals, dyes, radiation, pesticides, benzene and thousands of other toxic materials. Industrial uses of chemicals are growing so rapidly that voluntary exposure limits have been set for only 400 of the 6,000 chemicals in substantial use.

The federal government at present has no

authority to issue mandatory safety standards for various private occupations, with few exceptions like longshoremen, stevedores, maritime and to a smaller extent, coal miners and soon, uranium miners. Adverse health and safety conditions have been worsening in the past decade, while workmen's compensation benefits have not kept up with living costs. (One third of the labor force is not covered by any workmen's compensation).

Paralleling this deterioration is the pathetic and industry-indentured performance of the states, who traditionally have had exclusive jurisdiction over worker health and safety. Only 1,600 state safety inspectors are around, some tied by ambition, laziness or lucre to winking at violations. By contrast, the states retain at least double that number of fish and game wardens. Overall, the states' worker safety programs spend an average of 40 cents a year per non-agricultural worker, with Texas and Oklahoma, for example, spending about two cents per non-agricultural worker. Further, of the 1,600 state inspectors, about 700 inspect boilers, elevators and mines, leaving the remainder for general safety inspection, construction, safety promotion and education, health and industrial hygiene. Four states have no inspection staff at all; 17 states have fewer than 11 safety inspectors. More dismaying, only three states have staff specializing in the area of occupational health and industrial hygiene.

Over, underneath, and around this fragile state framework are the representatives of industry and commerce making certain that there is no applied sanctions to even the meek laws and controlling the process of developing standards, through their so-called United States Standards Institute of America (until 1966 the American Standards Association) whose promulgations are hurried into state statutes or regulations. Even data collection reflects the omnipresence of business: in 1966, less than half the states required employers to report all accidents and less than two-thirds of the states require employers to keep accident records. Just what constitutes work injury is defined for states by industry through the USA Standards Institute (USASI). The present standard 216.1 vests considerable authority in plant medical personnel in determining whether an injury constitutes an "injury," and does not count third-party fatalities in an industrial catastrophe as "industrial fatalities," even if they were employees in nearby establishments.

The factory climate surrounding data collection makes deep skepticism the minimal response to the Chamber of Commerce's claims of progress and superiority over other industrial nations. Accident and injury reporting in many industries, such as steel and autos, is deliberately aborted in numerous cases. Testimony before the House Education and Labor Subcommittee earlier this year by Public Health Service employees and medical professors cited cases such as a man bodily carried from his hospital and given a bed at the work place in order to eliminate lost time accidents. Less extraordinary but far more frequent are "make work" activities after injuries or "no-work" such as sitting the worker at a table doing nothing. Data on occupational diseases such as respiratory and liver ailments from toxic exposures are woefully incomplete, according to a report by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

One of the major canons of medical science—free communication—is severely undermined by the subordination of professional dictates to corporate expediences. Dr. Hawey A. Wells, a pathologist and professor at the University of West Virginia Medical School, offers two illustrations of little-known corporate censorship:

"A Dr. John Zalinsky told us about 30 cases of a chronic lung disease caused by exposure to 'safe' levels of beryllium dust. He was told by his company's management that if he

published these cases in the medical literature he would have to look for another job. He was torn between professional honesty and personal security—he had had one heart attack and would have difficulty in finding another job. Before he was able to resolve this dilemma, he died from another heart attack. His material has never been published.

"I have personal knowledge of a plant which uses manganese, long known to be a toxic metal. Through bitter experience, management recently found that it poisoned the nervous system, causing permanent brain damage in exposed workers. They are now using a simple test, no more complicated than a prick on the finger, to detect exposure to manganese long before permanent nerve injury occurs. Hundreds of other companies who now use manganese do not have the advantage of knowing about this simple test because it has not been published in this country.

"Unless each physician, each industrial hygienist, and safety engineer has available to him the research experience of all of those who preceded him in his profession, he must duplicate the research in every case, often at the cost of human life."

Under-reporting of occupational diseases is also related to inadequate state laws permitting health officials to have a right of entry into the plants. One plant in Pennsylvania (a right of entry state) was using the chemical beta naphthylamine, which a health specialist learned was causing carcinoma of the bladder. The plant promptly moved to Georgia (no right of entry state) and resumed operations unhindered.

Under-reporting has other harmful consequences. Not knowing the patient's occupational exposure, a physician can produce a mistaken diagnosis. For instance, the Public Health Service two years ago reported three "pneumonia" deaths that were later traced to the use of silver solder containing deadly cadmium.

Definitional absurdities have resulted in these abuses uncovered by the N.Y. State Department of Labor:

A plant employing over 2,000 persons did not consider reportable any injuries that did not entail lost time, nor did it report any temporary injuries that fell within the seven-day workmen's compensation waiting period. The corrected injury frequency rate was almost triple that originally reported by the firm.

Another firm, employing over 10,000, was reporting a low rate of injury by comparison with the rest of the large companies in the same industry, until it was discovered that it was reporting only compensable cases. This practice may require revising our notion that big plants are safer than small plants.

With both industry and the states grievously deficient in defining new hazards and in collecting adequate data, the cumulative toll annually of 500,000 disabled by occupational diseases, over two million disabled by occupational accidents and over seven million injured must be considered a substantial understatement. And we haven't begun to measure the deleterious effects of noise, artificial light, vibration and other assaults on man's physiological integrity.

The insurance industry, taking in \$2.3 billion in workmen's compensation premiums in 1967, spent an unspecified \$35 million on industrial safety and inspection. This relatively tiny sum has resulted in little loss prevention work and no significant contributions to data collection and retrieval. Contrary to popular impression, workmen's compensation insurance is enormously profitable to most companies with a range of between 10 and 35 percent gross margin profits in the past 20 years. Their public relations to the contrary, such insurance carriers have not been eager to publicize new worker hazards in any forum and have not shared their knowledge with governmental

authorities as befits good corporate citizenship. The highly touted safety record adjustment or "merit rating experience" applies for only 20 percent of all insurance risks. The underwriters have shown almost no interest in plugging loopholes in state laws—for example, only 18 state laws cover all employment. Others have exemptions of varying scope, such as all work activity except mining and construction.

Against such a background, it is not surprising that the Chamber and the National Association of Manufacturers are moving to block the federal bill by delaying it through the session or proposing a study commission in the alternative. Failing that, they will strive to strip it of meaningful penalties, surround it with advisory committees and demand usage of industry standards via USASI. Big business benefits from the do-little symbolic states laws with their financially starved administrators, and from the lower costs of insuring against risks of industrial injury that are possible with incomplete reporting of accidents, injuries and disease.

As now proposed by the Administration, the worker safety and health bill provides for setting mandatory standards applicable to employers affecting interstate commerce (roughly 50 million employees). The bill authorizes the Secretary of Labor to inspect the premises, issue cease and desist orders, and invoke other civil and criminal sanctions where necessary. Compliance with such standards can be made a condition of continuing federal contracts with the firm. The bill provides for grants up to 90 percent of the cost to the states to upgrade their role in data, inspection, enforcement and general administration. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is given a mission in research, training of personnel and developing safety criteria. The projected total cost over the next five years is estimated at \$300 million, or approximately \$30 million a year beyond current levels. Compare this sum with the cost in 1966 of work accidents and illnesses—\$6.8 billion.

Americans far from the blue-collar world have absorbed a decisive image of industry as gleaming, one-story, antiseptic space-age firms where rates of injuries and disease are not far from zero frequency. Unfortunately, work is getting more complex and dangerous all the time, not just for the blue-collar worker but for the white-coated scientist or laboratory technician handling exotic materials. Dr. Miriam Sachs told the House Subcommittee in February something of this trend when she described the "shift from a mechanical to a broadly diversified array of new hazards," including many new agricultural hazards flowing from the use of synthetic chemicals as fertilizers or as pesticides.

Secretary of Labor Wirtz, in perhaps the most feeling testimony of his career, told the Senate subcommittee on Labor what the grisly evidence points to as the central issue:

"It is whether the Congress is going to act to stop a carnage which continues for one reason, and one reason only, and that is because the people in this country don't realize what is involved, and they can't see the blood on the food that they eat, and on the things that they buy, and on the services they get."

Secretary Wirtz has the facts, enough in themselves for action, but pointing to a larger dimension of industrial neglect than was thought possible a year ago. One datum in his testimony: half of the nation's 137,000 coal miners suffer from the cruel dust disease—pneumoconiosis of the lungs; they breathe with difficulty and spit black sputum daily. Not many Americans know of this human depletion when they receive the benefits of coal energy. That's what Secretary Wirtz is talking about and that is what the Chamber of Commerce doesn't want us to hear.

BUSINESS LED THE FIGHT FOR LIBERTY

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1968

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as we are in the bicentennial period of the American Revolution, I particularly wanted to call to the attention of the House an article that appeared in the April issue of *Nation's Business* by Bob Considine entitled "Business Led the Fight for Liberty."

In 1767, the English Parliament adopted the hated Townshend Acts and other measures such as this that would manage to crystallize opinion in the American Colonies 200 years ago.

The article is as follows:

BUSINESS LED THE FIGHT FOR LIBERTY (By Bob Considine)

It all started long before the shot was fired that was heard around the world.

Businessmen in the then bolstorous seaport of New York struck many of the American colonies' first blows for liberty years before the revolution.

What galvanized those early merchants to action was more than threats to commerce. It was the longing to rid themselves of a tyranny that oppressed the very spirit of the colonies.

Resentment of British rule surged in waves as the Crown placed more and more restrictions on trade and issued its edicts in high-handed manner in the New World. But it was the Stamp Act, imposing unreasonable taxes, which finally stung the colonies like a lash.

The so-called Stamp Act Congress convened in New York's City Hall Oct. 7, 1765, gavelled into session by Mayor-businessman John Cruger Jr. Twenty-seven delegates from nine of the 13 colonies attended.

Cruger proved himself to be the catalyst between the Congress's hawks and doves. Though he was mayor of a rowdy and hardly cultural town of 200,000 he was a man of great dignity and prudence. He and his brother, Henry, were pillars in the city's chief industry. Their fleet of ships engaged in general trade with England and the West Indies.

The Congress deliberated under the gun. Nov. 1 had been designated by London as the day the stamps must be used. A ship carrying the hated stickers, bearing the chop of King George III, dropped anchor in the harbor while the delegates were in caucus.

His Majesty's lieutenant governor of the colony took the occasion to inform the Congress, and the city at large, that the Act would be enforced. Lieut. Gov. Cadwallader Colden was known to be a man of his word, too. And he had a Fort George at the tip of Manhattan to back up that word.

In those tense hours, John Cruger wrote, and the Congress voted in favor of, a Declaration of the Rights and Grievances of the Colonists in America. It asserted that all subjects of the King in America had the same rights and liberties as those in Britain. Taxation without consent was a violation of those rights, it continued, and inasmuch as Parliament's doors were closed to colonists, the colonies, and the colonies alone, must levy their own taxes through their legislatures.

This momentous document preceded the Declaration of Independence by more than 10 years.

This was followed by a boycott on British imports, which blocked the issuance of the dreaded stamps and brought about a shake-up in British political circles.

But the triumph over the Stamp Act was tempered abruptly. Fresh, harsh new orders were issued from London.

The Townshend Acts of 1767 placed import duties on glass, lead, paints, paper and tea, while at the same time reducing taxes in Great Britain.

Greatly disturbed, as a patriot and businessman, John Cruger resolved that only through the establishment of an organization of New York business leaders could the city and the colony hope to protect itself against the Townshend Acts and other impending encroachments.

Accordingly, he called a meeting of 19 other like-minded merchants at Bolton & Sigell's Restaurant, also known as Fraunce's Tavern, at Broad and Pearl Streets, on April 5, 1768. From that assembly, historic in its vision and sense of high purpose, came the now 200-year-old document which established the "New York Chamber of Commerce."

THE CHAMBER'S FIRST PRESIDENT

Cruger was elected the first president, Hugh Wallace, vice president, Elias Desbrosses, treasurer, and Anthony Van Dam, secretary.

The Chamber's early rules and regulations reveal the seriousness of the undertaking. The disciplines invoked reflect the nature of the founder; the positions it took were those that followed the dictates of his conscience.

That he knew how to conduct a seemly assembly may be seen through the rule that decreed that any member failing to rise and address the chair when he had a proposal to make, or interrupting another member while speaking, should forfeit one shilling.

Those who absented themselves from a meeting, or arrived late or left early without the consent of the president, were fined. Sickness or being six miles away from the city were considered reasonable excuses for being absent.

The minutes of early meetings of the Chamber show that lenience was extended to certain absentees who, on meeting nights, found themselves marooned in such outposts as "Jerseys," "Setauket," and "flat Bush."

The Chamber fought vigorously and usually successful for sounder money, purer food, standardized weights and measures and, always, it campaigned for equal rights with other subjects of the King.

Thomas Paine was to write, eight years after the formation of the Chamber, that those were the times that tried mens souls. The soul of John Cruger had long since been tried and found trustworthy.

Everything in his all too slender dossier suggests a man beset by warring devotions. He respected the Crown; he revered liberty. Let the militant Sons of Liberty shout in the dockside taverns of the city, and brawl on occasion with the troops of the Fort George garrison. Mayor Cruger would find some middle road, some honorable way to achieve the land's just rights without the spilling of blood.

Two of his moves especially typify his hope of averting an open break with the mother country.

On May 2, 1769, while doubling as Speaker of the General Assembly, he spearheaded a resolution which put the Assembly on record as a solid front against further British arrogations.

It took the form of a letter to the merchants of the city and the colony expressing "the thanks of the House for their repeated disinterested, public-spirited and patriotic conduct in declining the importation of goods from Great Britain until such Acts of Parliament as the General Assembly had declared unconstitutional and subversive of the rights and liberties of the people of this colony should be repealed."

It gave the merchants the status of militia-men, even minutemen.

CHAMBER GETS ITS CHARTER

But on Feb. 15, 1770, with the approval of the Chamber, Cruger requested Lieutenant Governor Colden to grant a charter incorporating the organization. The lieutenant governor was delighted by the application.

"I think it a good institution and will always be glad to promote the Commercial Interests of this City, and shall deem it a peculiar happiness that a society so beneficial to the General good of the Province is incorporated during my administration," he wrote.

The royal charter, heavy with King George's seal, arrived within the next month. Merchant-Mayor Cruger repaired to Fort George, with the consent of his colleagues, thanked Lieutenant Governor Colden for the aid he had rendered, and read as follows:

"We beg leave to assure your Honour that our utmost Ambition is to approve ourselves useful members of the Community, submissive to the Laws, zealous for the Support of Government, and our happy Constitution, and firmly attached to our most Gracious Sovereign; and that we will exert ourselves on all occasions to promote the General Interest of the Colony, and the Commerce of this City in particular; that the Utility of the Institution and the Wisdom of its Founder may be equally applauded by the latest Posterity."

The original royal charter said in part:

"Whereas, a great number of merchants in our City of New York, in America, have, by voluntary agreement, associated themselves for the laudable purpose of promoting the trade and commerce of our said province; and whereas, John Cruger, Esq., the present President of the said Society . . . hath represented to our Lieutenant-Governor, that the said Society (sensible that numberless inestimable benefits have accrued to mankind from commerce; that they are, in proportion to their greater or lesser application to it, more or less opulent and potent in all countries; and that the enlargement of trade will vastly increase the value of real estates, as well as the general opulence of our said colony) have associated together for some time past, in order to carry into execution among themselves, and by their example to promote in others, such measures as were beneficial to those salutary purposes. . . .

"Therefore, we being willing to further the laudable designs of our said loving subjects, and to give stability to an institution from whence great advantages may arise, as well as to our kingdom of Great Britain as to our said province . . ."

In substance, the monarch approved of the articles previously adopted by the Chamber and tossed its members additional crumbs: They and their successors might acquire real estate to the value of £3,000 sterling, mint a common seal and build a meeting place of their own, now that their numbers were swelling.

THE WAR YEARS

Hugh Wallace, an Irish-born merchant followed Cruger as Chamber president. He was to embrace the British cause when the revolution broke out.

Wallace's tenure as president was brief. He was followed by Desbrosses, a rich realtor of Huguenot descent who was one of the founders and strong supporters of the French Episcopal Church of St. Esprit, in Pine Street and a vestryman and warden of Trinity Church.

Henry White succeeded to the presidency in May, 1772. He, too, was intensely loyal to the Crown.

As war neared, John Cruger's "cool"—as it came to be known a long time later—was sorely tested. A profile of him, written years later, defines his torments:

"His course during the eventful period of

1775, when patriotic blood boiled . . . on receipt of the news of the Lexington outrage, was marked by a calm, dignified courage and self-reliance; and while he did not take an active part in the beginning of the contest, from conscientious scruples which his official position (Mayor and Speaker) imposed upon him, his sympathies were nevertheless with the people in their efforts to secure redress for the wrongs done them by the mother country."

Evidence of his desire for peace is shown in a letter to General Gage, the British commander, May 5, 1775, in which Cruger pleaded for moderation.

But hotter heads than Cruger's prevailed. For a period, mobs drove him out of the City Hall and took over, during which time several British merchantmen were seized in the harbor and their goods stolen or burned.

In April, 1776, New York was taken by Gen. Israel Putnam. George Washington moved his headquarters to the city, not long after that.

In August of that same year, British Adm. Richard Howe's fleet appeared, laden with the human and mechanical hardware of war.

The British fought their way ashore at Gravesend Bay Aug. 22, took Brooklyn Heights Aug. 27. The big push, however, was yet to come. Gen. Washington, having pulled his troops into the city from Long Island, braced for it. But his men were no match for the troops Howe landed at Kips Bay, on the East Side of what is now mid-Manhattan.

They stretched their lines across the islands to the Hudson, a line that became Thirty-fourth Street. But Washington broke through and took up a new and impregnable position on Harlem heights.

John Cruger went with Washington's men in his moment of truth. He had gone for broke.

Cruger lived to see Washington's triumphant return to New York, the ecstasy of independence and the rebirth of his beloved Chamber.

SOVIET PERSECUTION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, one advantage granted the Soviets by ratification of the Communist Consular Treaty has been a license to intimidate foreign-born American citizens in the United States.

I am in receipt of letters from Mr. Tedis Zierins, an American of Latvian descent, who exposes a program of conspiratorial harassment so that the American people may know the threats from Soviet-United States bridge building.

Even more frightening, our citizens are forced to exposure by controlled propaganda to sell the idea that the flying of Communist airlines to and from our country is of historic importance in some cause of world peace.

Are we to believe that Russian jets piloted by Soviet military officers are so routed as not to fly over our defense systems? What a ruse to authorize the Russian air force firsthand knowledge of our skies and facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that Mr. Zierins' letters follow my comments. I think by his courage and fearless exposure of the Communist exploitation of our friend-

ship Mr. Zierins is entitled to the gratitude of every loyal American. The question really posed by Mr. Zierins is "What happens if Soviet consuls kidnap Americans of foreign extraction and whisk them by the convenient jet airliners behind the Iron Curtain?"

[From the Aurora (Ill.) Beacon-News, July 16, 1968]

SOVIET PERSECUTION

At the same time as ratification documents of the consular treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union were signed at the White House by Soviet Ambassador Dobrynin recently, the consular division of the Soviet Embassy asked some American citizens why they are "still lingering" in the United States. While the Soviet "Committee on Cultural Exchange with Countrymen in Foreign Countries" was inviting all in sweet words to visit the capital of occupied Latvia, the consular division of the Soviet Embassy in Washington was requesting information of the former addresses of visitors to Latvia, who had returned to the United States after visiting there.

About one such occasion you can read also in Latvian language newspaper "Lalks" (published in New York by loyal American citizens) on June 26, 1968:

"On May 30, the 3rd secretary of the Soviet Embassy, V. Muratov," wrote to Mrs. C. Lapins, East Rockaway, N.Y.: (the letter is written in Russian language).

"Dear Mrs. Lapins, "We ask you to notify us as to the reasons which retain you in the U.S.A. and about your future plans. If you intend to remain in the U.S.A., send to our address a personal certificate, stating and explaining in it the reasons which have caused your stay in the U.S.A. and your former address in Soviet Union."

It is self evident that the receiver of this letter, who already for 16 years is a citizen of the United States, was angered to the utmost degree by such Soviet provocation. She explains:

"I have never had the slightest intention to return to the Soviet Union, and I have not voted for the annexation of Latvia to the Soviet Union. When in 1940 the Soviet army invaded Latvia, I was a student at the art academy. The Soviet agent who was in charge of supervising the activities there, wanted to expel me, because I was interested in sacral paintings. In 1941, during June 13 and 14, when the mass deportations took place in Latvia and its neighbors Lithuania and Estonia, they searched for me at my apartment in order to deport me to Siberia, but I was not at home and thus escaped.

"I am a citizen of the United States for 16 years, and I cannot understand why the Soviet Embassy bothers me with a letter asking me to return to the Soviet Union."

That is only one example how Soviets bother American citizens who once have lived under the Communist tyranny.

To some others they send Soviet newspapers with smear articles about the receivers or their friends. For instance, several times Soviet newspaper "Dzintenes Balss" (Voice of Homeland) has attacked me for writing letters to the editors of American newspapers.

No matter how long we are loyal American citizens, Moscow still considers us Soviet citizens.

TEDIS ZIERINS.

CHICAGO, ILL.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Community Publications, July 17, 1968]

PEOPLE HERE MISLED BY RUSSIAN RABBI

Yehuda Leib Levin was the first rabbi from the Soviet Union to visit the United States.

His trip was very well prepared. Rabbi Levin declared "Jewish people receive in the Soviet land their rightful place to live and to contribute to the advancement of our country and the happiness of the Jewish people as a whole."

To support this statement Rabbi Levin had a movie which shows his Moscow's Grand Choral Synagogue gleaming and artistically faultless, filled with well dressed, happy looking parishioners.

But this one example of beauty and imposing tradition does not convince those people who know that the Communist regime ruthlessly continues its drive to eliminate all belief in God, whether Jewish, Christian, Moslem or others.

Since 1956 alone the Soviets have closed almost 400 synagogues. Now there are only 60 synagogues left for 3 million Jews in the Soviet Union, while here in the United States, there are almost 5,000 synagogues for 5.7 million Jews.

In Moscow there are more Jews than in the greater Chicago area, but besides the Levin's beautiful synagogue, which the Kremlin uses as a showplace for foreign visitors, there is only one other smaller synagogue.

How can one speak of rightful place for his people, if there are only two synagogues for 300,000 Jews in Moscow? How can one speak of happiness of his people if they are forced to abandon their houses of worship? That is not happiness, that is spiritual genocide and Moscow has sent Rabbi Yehuda Leib Levin to mislead the people here.

No wonder that the U.S. Communist party official newspaper "The Worker," June 25, 1968, calls everybody, rightwing extremist and holligans, who refuses to accept Rabbi Levin's misleading statements.

TEDIS ZIERINS.

TO LIMIT MANDATORY REPLIES TO CERTAIN QUESTIONS IN THE DECENNIAL CENSUS TAKING

HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which would curb the ever-expanding invasion of our citizens' right to privacy when the U.S. census is taken. My bill would limit mandatory replies to only seven questions asked by the census taker, leaving any answers to any remaining questions strictly on a voluntary basis. It becomes increasingly apparent that the census data are being used to provide business indexes, whether washing machines or other household appliances are owned, or other matters which are not related to the day-to-day operation of the Federal Government.

To require, under Federal penalty, mandatory replies to such census questions is to me a very serious invasion of our citizens' right to privacy. I urge my bill be referred to the appropriate committee for action. Hearings have been held on similar bills already and I would hope that the distinguished chairman of the Census and Statistics Subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN], will consider bringing this measure out of committee when Congress reconvenes after the nominating conventions.

A. L. ALFORD: A GREAT EDITOR

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, last Saturday one of Idaho's great editors and publishers, A. L. Alford, died, the victim of a cerebral hemorrhage. Bud Alford, as he was known to his hundreds of friends, had been editor of the Lewiston Morning Tribune since 1928, and publisher since 1946. In the many years he was associated with the Tribune, he built for his paper a reputation for integrity and intelligence. It may well be the best newspaper of its size in the country today.

As the Idaho Daily Statesman said in commenting upon the loss Idaho has sustained in Bud Alford's death:

From the time he became managing editor in 1928 until the day he died, A. L. Alford was dedicated to making the Tribune an extension of himself—Independent, demanding of accuracy and a total record of the day.

Bud Alford shunned publicity. In the words of the Tribune's lead editorial the day after he died:

That was partly because he was a modest man, but mostly because he didn't consider it professional for newspapermen to celebrate themselves.

Mr. President, Idaho journalism has lost a leader. I have lost a valued and trusted friend.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an article on the life and work of Bud Alford, which was published in the Lewiston Tribune of July 21, and two editorials, one by Bill Hall, of the Tribune staff, the other by James Golden, of the Idaho Daily Statesman, in Boise.

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune, July 21, 1968]

A. L. ALFORD, TRIBUNE EDITOR, DIES

Albert L. (Bud) Alford, 61, editor and publisher of the Lewiston Morning Tribune since 1946, and an executive of the newspaper since 1928, died at 5:15 p.m. yesterday at Sacred Heart Hospital, Spokane, from the effects of a cerebral hemorrhage suffered Friday night at 11 at his home, 1402 8th Ave.

Alford was stricken on the patio of his home a few minutes before he had planned to retire for the night. He also sustained a skull fracture when he fell.

He was taken to St. Joseph's Hospital from his home by ambulance and flown to the Spokane hospital for emergency treatment at 7:30 yesterday morning. He never regained consciousness.

One of the Pacific Northwest's best known editors, Alford was widely respected in national journalism circles. Under his leadership, the Lewiston Morning Tribune became one of the most widely read small city daily newspapers in the United States, and is used as a study guide in university journalism schools.

Alford's 43-year association with the Tribune began in the spring of 1928 when his uncle, Albert H. Alford, the Tribune managing editor, died. Alford returned to Lewiston from Washington & Lee University, Lexington, Va., to assume the managing editorship. He immediately began to attract attention

both for the clarity of his editorials and the quality and depth of the news columns. As managing editor, Alford guided the Tribune and its readers through the depression and World War II.

He became editor and publisher in April, 1946, upon the death of his father, E. L. Alford—who with Albert H. Alford founded the newspaper as a weekly in 1892.

DUTIES INCREASE

As editor and publisher, the scope of his duties became greater, but he maintained intimate contact with all departments and personnel in supervising daily production of the Tribune.

In his capacity as a newspaper executive, Alford was a leading figure in American journalism. He was elected in 1966 to membership in the American Society of Newspaper Editors, the leading professional organization for editors, and was a past president of the Utah-Idaho Associated Press.

Alford was twice nominated as a director of the Associated Press, the international news gathering organization of which the Tribune has been a member since 1898.

He was a member and former director of the Pacific Northwest Newspaper Ass'n and a former director of the Allied Daily Newspapers of Washington.

Alford was nominated four times to attend the press seminars conducted by the American Press Institute at Columbia University, New York.

Alford made two Pacific cruises as guest of the Secretary of Navy.

He was a member of the Palouse Empire Chapter of Sigma Delta Chi, a national journalism society.

Both as managing editor and editor and publisher, Alford's paramount interest was in the prosperous development of the Lewiston-Clarkston region based upon its geographic location and natural resources.

He was a key figure in the opening of the Snake River through a series of dams which would bring year-round navigation between Portland and Lewiston and in the Lewis & Clark Highway linking Lewiston with Missoula, Mont.

Both these campaigns were successful. The dams on the lower Snake River will bring slackwater navigation to Lewiston-Clarkston in the early 1970s and the Lewis & Clark Highway was finished in 1962.

He also had a deep interest in the history of Lewiston and all of Idaho. He was chairman of the Idaho Historical Society board at the time of his death and frequently attended society meetings at Boise.

From its inception in 1935 until early this year, Alford was a director of the Lewiston Roundup Ass'n. In retiring from the board, he said that it was time for younger men to assume responsibility for the Roundup. He was the oldest member of the board in terms of service at the time he retired.

SERVED ON DRAFT BOARD

Alford was appointed to the Nez Perce County Selective Service Board when it was organized in 1940 and continued as a member until 1950.

In 1961, at the time the Tribune moved into the present building at 505 C St., Alford was presented an outstanding achievement award by the Greater Lewiston Chamber of Commerce. In a speech presenting the award, Dr. Donald K. Worden, a former Lewiston mayor, said he had only been misquoted once during eight years as mayor.

"Such a record and such devotion to accuracy reflects not only good policy but good training and supervision," Dr. Worden said.

A lifelong Democrat of independent persuasion, Alford had attended every Democratic and Republican national convention since 1932 and had been planning to go to the Democratic convention at Chicago and the Republican convention at Miami Beach this summer.

At each convention, he wrote dispatches for the Tribune readers on convention progress, with particular emphasis on the Idaho delegations, including small details not included in general press coverage. He was an official Idaho delegate at several Democratic conventions.

Alford was a guest of President John F. Kennedy at a White House luncheon for editors held in 1962.

As a combined editor and publisher, Alford recognized that a newspaper pursuing excellence must strike a balance between news and advertising, and that revenue in advertising must be allied with news columns of quality and thoroughness.

In striking this balance for the Tribune, Alford employed a greater number of editorial employees than most newspapers with comparable size and circulation.

Although duty required him to supervise total production, Alford's chief interest remained in the newsroom he reluctantly left in 1946.

Blessed with a phenomenal memory and a passion for minuscule detail, Alford read each morning's issue of the Tribune from the back page to the front page with a thoroughness none of his staff members could match. From the news columns he dredged ideas for future stories and logged them in his date book. Much of each day's issue of the Tribune including today's and many days to come was based upon his voluminous recording of the life and times of the residents of the Lewiston-Clarkston region.

BRIEFS BEST READ

Of particular importance to Alford was the News In Brief column, which he considered the best read section of the Tribune. He wrote his own news briefs, provided tips on others and expected his staff members to do the same.

His office was not that of a business executive, but of an editor keeping abreast of the news. The working space on his desk was reduced through the years to a small bare patch surrounded by mounds of paper, each sheet of which bore some relation to the operation of the Lewiston Morning Tribune.

Perhaps Alford summed up his own philosophy as a newspaperman best in 1961 when he wrote in a special edition of the Tribune at the time the newspaper moved to its present home:

"... fortunately a newspaper does not live in or for the past. It must live in the present, the breathing, pulsating, living present. It must be prescient and ever look forward into the future which, in this case, we confidently believe is full of promise and the challenge of limitless achievement.

"This newspaper has faith that the Lewis-Clark Empire is on the threshold of an era of new and sustained progress and improvement without parallel in its history. It aspires to continue to grow with this great country and to be worthy of its opportunities for service.

PLEDGE FOR FUTURE

"For this future, the Tribune's pledge is that we shall continue to do our best to deserve continued public confidence and support. We shall endeavor to print the news fully and impartially, interpreting the chronicle of the passing days to the best of our ability and with due regard for the common interest, and in joining the strength of our influence with all other forces for advancement."

Alford was born at Lewiston Jan. 7, 1907, the son of Mr. and Mrs. E. L. Alford.

He graduated from Lewiston High School in 1924 and attended the University of Idaho for two years, where he was a member of the Sigma Nu fraternity and worked on the staff of the student newspaper, the Argonaut. He transferred to Washington & Lee University in 1926, and studied there until returning to Lewiston in 1928.

He was married to the former Catherine Hann Jan. 10, 1931, at Lewiston. She died Sept. 8, 1964.

He married the former Mary E. Wagner Aug. 25, 1966, at Lewiston.

Alford was a member of the Presbyterian Church, the Lewiston Elks Lodge, the Lewiston and Clarkston country clubs and Phi Chi social fraternity.

In addition to his widow, he is survived by two sons, Charles H. Alford, advertising manager of the Tribune, and A. L. Alford, Jr., general manager of the Tribune; his mother, Mrs. E. L. Alford; two sisters, Mrs. Eugenia Hamblin and Mrs. John H. Matlock; a stepdaughter, Shelly Wagner, and three grandchildren, Albert L. Alford III (Brid), and Gordon H. Alford, sons of Mr. and Mrs. Albert L. Alford, Jr.; and Catherine Alford, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Charles H. Alford. His younger brother, George Gordon Alford, was killed in an airplane crash during World War II.

The body is being brought to the Vassar-Rawls Funeral Home. Funeral arrangements are pending.—T.W.C.

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune, July 21, 1968]

A. L. ALFORD—A NEWSPERMAN

There is an unwritten rule in this business that we shouldn't talk too much about our own.

Telling the public about newspapers and newspapermen can get out of hand. It becomes self-serving, even vain.

Thus, we examine in minute detail the personalities of those in other walks of life, but sometimes overlook the substance of the few genuine giants in our own business.

One of them was A. L. (Bud) Alford, the editor and publisher of this newspaper. There has been no more rigid adherent to the unwritten rule against self-glorification than he. By any measure, he was an important and significant figure in this state and region, a man of broad personal acquaintance with the minor and the mighty. But he shunned personal publicity. That was partly because he was a modest man, but mostly because he didn't consider it professional for newspapermen to celebrate themselves.

So there is probably no other man in this state of equal influence and substance who has had so little written about him.

But death, unexpected, untimely and unfair, has repealed that unwritten rule for the moment. It is time now to talk about Bud Alford.

He was what many of us are afraid is a vanishing breed—the independent and really quite fearless publisher of a home-grown, home-owned newspaper.

Many of the smaller independent dailies across the nation have been disappearing in recent years into what someone once called chain store journalism. They have been acquired by corporations looking for good investments and are run from afar in home distant head office by men generally ignorant of the communities in which their properties are located.

The executives dispatched from headquarters to operate these chain store properties are primarily businessmen. Bud Alford was a rarity among publishers today, paradoxically, because he was first and foremost a newspaperman.

The newspaper business was his work, his hobby, his life. He was in the office seven days a week, working in his shirtsleeves behind a desk heaped incredibly high with file folders, clippings, old newspapers and everything else he needed (and much that he didn't), all at his finger tips. It was a splendid mess, the way a real newspaperman should always keep his desk.

From behind that wall of papers he fired a daily barrage of terse directives and critiques to his staff in the style of a traditional

ramrodding city editor. He read every line of the paper almost every day. The corporations would call it quality control.

The coverage he demanded and usually received from his staff was intensive and detailed for a community this large. It is understood in the newspaper business that a weekly paper can do a story every time somebody sneezes, but not a daily in a community this size. However, someone forgot to tell Bud Alford it was impossible. So we did it. The readers expected it.

You might say he was a perfectionist, and he probably was, but that word conjures up inaccurate visions of some sort of frantic efficiency expert with a whip in his hand. Bud Alford was a quiet, even a shy man, in love with his newspaper and his community and loyal to both. The simplest way to explain his idea of running a newspaper is to say he ploughed more of the profits back into the product than he had to or anyone else would have.

Those who tried to go over the head of a staff member and tattle about real or imagined grievances to the boss were wasting their time. The boss stood behind his employees.

Would-be sacred cows were invited to leave. The rare case of an advertiser threatening economic retribution for an editorial was met with the explanation that "our opinions are not for sale." And neither were the news columns.

In short, the Tribune was run the way a newspaper should be, by a newspaperman who knew more about its operation than any member of his staff and didn't deviate from his own high standard of ethics.

A part of Lewiston-Clarkston from his birth, he kept it that way. He carried on in the family tradition that made this community a part of the Tribune and vice versa.

From his guidance and example the same spirit is deeply imbued in those who will carry on. That is his legacy to the readers and the profession he served.

[From the Boise (Idaho) Daily Statesman, July 22, 1968]

A. L. ALFORD: A SINGULAR NEWSPERMAN

Outside the cubicles of power in this state and the fraternal gatherings of newspapermen Bud Alford was not well known in Southern Idaho. He was editor and publisher of the Lewiston Morning Tribune at the time of his death at 61 Saturday. Mr. Alford had been publisher since 1946.

From the time he became managing editor in 1928 until the day he died A. L. Alford was dedicated to making the Tribune an extension of himself—Independent, demanding of accuracy and a total record of the day. Mr. Alford personally kept a daily compendium of births, anniversaries and other personal events in Lewiston and Clarkston and filed much of it in his impressive memory.

A liberal in the best sense of the word, Bud Alford believed in change and time after time in the face of entrenched conservatism in North Idaho put the Tribune on the line in favor of progress. It is not an overstatement to say that he was as nearly fearless as an intelligent and sensitive man can be.

Bud Alford had two principal interests in newspapering and he maintained an intense and demanding concern for them. One was his editorial page. The other was the local news columns. He reviewed every editorial after he became publisher. He wrote some in that flowing style of his—always unidentified. When he did write one, the newspaper staff instantly recognized his work. It was usually about some good friend or associate, written in a warmth that one did not notice until he knew him well.

Bud Alford had a newspaperman's perfect combination of toughness and courtliness. He wanted nothing less for the Tribune than to make it the best newspaper of its size in the nation.

Errors, however trivial, were abhorrent to him, and every one hurt Bud Alford a little. There are college students by the dozen who have known the wrath of the publisher for a misspelled name, a lazy attempt at getting a middle initial or a sloppy story. He read every word of the Tribune every day and turned out a sheet swiftly isolating errors.

He taught newspapermen who stuck it out the importance of accuracy and fairness. At the Tribune they learned or they left.

The lingering stigma of a foolish mistake is cut into every Tribune graduate. Bud Alford was neither a vindictive man nor—generally—unforgiving. He forgot long before the reporter or editor who perpetrated the misdeed.

In addition to being a perceptive businessman, civic leader and political progressive, Bud Alford worked quietly to improve Idaho journalism. He was chagrined at times by some untrained college graduate who bent to the task of producing his newspaper, but he saw in them the future and he did not flinch from maintaining an arduous training program.

Alumni of the Tribune are scattered throughout the state, many on newspapers—including The Statesman.

Two sons remain to carry on the Alford newspaper tradition that goes back to 1892.

So singular was Bud Alford, so great was his impact on Idaho journalism at its best, he merits far more than a ritual farewell from his contemporaries. He is a part of the Tribune and the Tribune was an abiding part of his life.

MOVE AFOOT TO UNTIE MILITARY GAG

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

MOVE AFOOT TO UNTIE MILITARY GAG

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

A move is afoot to restore the Joint Chiefs of Staff to its traditional role as the top echelon defense planning board.

The House Armed Services Committee stated it will establish in the next Congress a manpower subcommittee to oversee the extent to which the Pentagon is overstaffed by "some policy-making civilians" who "seem to know the cost of everything but the value of nothing."

The committee declared in its report on the military authorization bill, "There is an ever-increasing gargantuan bureaucracy now in existence in the Department of Defense that has almost unlimited power to defer, delay, overstudy, or cancel weapons systems."

As a result, the legislators said, "morale among the officers of the armed services has been steadily eroding."

One way to reverse this trend is to substantially curtail the authority and number of those who have been trained throughout their adult lives in the art of defense."

The committee recommended a 10 percent across the board reduction in the number of civilian employees in defense agencies, especially in policy-affecting areas. Specifically, it recommended "substantial reductions" in the office of the assistant secretary of defense (systems analysis) and office of the assistant secretary of defense (public affairs).

The issue is whether the battlefield-experienced military officers should be paramount on military matters, or whether as now, a nonmilitary civilian staff shall hand

down the decisions on the basis of non-battlefield theories.

The National Security Act of 1947 plainly established the Joint Chiefs of Staff as the top military planning agency of government, but beginning with Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara its recommendations on defense matters have been consistently overridden. This has been justified in the name of civilian control of the military.

The concept of civilian control of the military, which military men like other Americans strongly support, refers to control of the military establishment by a legitimately elected government. However, this concept has been twisted to mean civilian command of the military.

Under the practice of civilian command of the military, civilian analysts at the Pentagon give detailed directions to military forces concerning matters which are operationally and constitutionally a military responsibility.

Ever-thickening layers of civilian bureaucracy are blanketing military views.

A survey showed 2,157 civilians and 810 military personnel just in the single office of the secretary of defense. In the organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff there were 483 civilians and 1,375 military personnel.

Section 143 of title 10, United States Code, provides for the Joint Chiefs of Staff to select a staff of 400 officers with the approval of its chairman.

Directly under the office of the secretary of defense are: the Defense Atomic Support Agency, the Defense Communications Agency, the Defense Contract Audit Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the Defense Supply Agency and other agencies. These activities employ more than 70,000 civilians and almost 10,000 military personnel.

The "united" staff agencies bypass the Joint Chiefs of Staff and report directly to the secretary of defense. The experienced military officers have become little more than figureheads under these procedures.

The office of the assistant secretary of defense for international security affairs runs the military assistance program, and in this capacity has the final word (short of the secretary of defense and the President) in making military decisions on Vietnam.

Senior civilians juggle troops and plan air strikes on the basis of their supposedly superior "policy" knowledge, and justify this by manipulation of the principle of "civilian control of the military."

The United States is on a course that, unless drastically changed, will destroy our nation.

Surely, this deserves our most sober attention irrespective of all political considerations.

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S FINEST
HOUR

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Sol Feinstein, of Washington Crossing, Pa., has spent a lifetime studying the life and career of George Washington, and today possesses an outstanding historical collection of Washington documents and holograph letters.

The Syracuse University Press this year published an article entitled "Ten Days That Changed the World," written by Mr. Feinstein, which underscores the significance of George Washington's 10-day battle at Trenton and Princeton in New Jersey. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEN DAYS THAT CHANGED THE WORLD—
GEORGE WASHINGTON'S FINEST HOUR
(By Sol Feinstone)

When the American reporter, John Reed, was visiting Russia in late 1917, he witnessed the seizure of power by Lenin from the weak Kerensky provisional government, and recorded the success of this Bolshevik Revolution in a volume entitled *Ten Days That Shook the World*, originally published in 1919.

The instant and shocking conversion of Czarist Russia into the Soviet Union did indeed shake the world to its roots.

This event undoubtedly prolonged World War I and fostered the development of Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany, both of which provoked World War II. During the post war period Soviet activities and influence resulted in the communization of China, North Korea, North Vietnam and Cuba, and currently are keeping the Far East and the Near East and some portions of Africa in a constant state of turmoil and confusion. The system that has its foundation in the tragic events of October and November, 1917, now threatens the Free World from pole to pole.

Fortunately, before the ten days described by John Reed, there had been ten other days that turned the tide in the American Revolution from apparent defeat to ultimate victory. Much has been written about these ten days in Trenton and Princeton, from Christmas Day 1776 to January 3, 1777, but the passage of time has worn away the true significance of this great period in the history of our country.

Unfortunately, some historians deal unjustly with the makers of history and events of their lifetimes. Myths and legends that distort the character of the hero are spread and widely accepted as fact. As a collector of original manuscripts and documents, I first learned that the American Revolution, which was led to success by George Washington, was not primarily commercial or economic, but *basically the struggle of Free Men to remain free*. These manuscripts revealed to me that Washington was not a haughty aristocrat, ambitious to become a duke or king, but on the contrary, was a warm-hearted, sometimes temperamental, self-disciplined gentleman who maintained the welfare of the American people and the future greatness of our country as his primary concern and determination.

By the summer of 1775, the thirteen British colonies in America had begun military resistance to the tyranny they had experienced within the Imperial System. In July, 1776, these colonies declared themselves politically independent of the mother country. King George III and some of his Parliamentary leaders determined to crush this rebellion quickly and decisively. During the spring and summer of that year the revolutionary forces under Washington suffered defeat after defeat. The rebels were beaten at Long Island, Manhattan, White Plains and driven from New York state as the enemy captured both Fort Washington and Fort Lee. The British chased Washington across New Jersey, but the Americans escaped over the Delaware River into Pennsylvania and prevented the enemy from following by seizing all river craft within a forty mile area.

The American Cause was at its lowest ebb in December 1776. The small and tired American army was encamped along the Delaware River from Bristol to Coryell's Ferry, now called New Hope. General Charles Lee, considered by many critics of Washington to have been the ablest American Field Commander, had been taken prisoner under suspicious circumstances. The Continental Congress had fled from Philadelphia to Baltimore. The British Commander, General William Howe, had threatened to cross the river

with superior forces for the final blow in the spring or sooner.

On December 18, 1776, from his camp near the Falls of Trenton, General Washington wrote to his brother, John Augustine, as follows: "... between you and me, I think our Affairs are in a very bad situation; not so much from the apprehension of Genl. Howe's Army, as from the defection of New York, Jerseys, and Pennsylvania. In short, the Conduct of the Jerseys has been most Infamous. Instead of turning out to defend their Country and affording aid to our Army, they are making their submissions as fast as they can . . . if every nerve is not strain'd to recruit the New Army with all possible expedition, I think the game is pretty near up . . . No man, I believe, ever had a greater choice of difficulties and less means to extricate himself from them. However, under a full persuasion of the justice of our Cause I cannot but think the prospect will brighten . . ."

Washington did not know how the prospect would brighten, but he did know that he could not wait for spring to take a stand, which he hoped would stop defections to the Crown and stimulate new enlistments for the Cause. Having already received unlimited powers from the Continental Congress, he was entirely and solely responsible. He was compelled to plan for immediate action. He alone had to decide.

Historians say that Washington ordered his staff and field officers to convene as a council of war and give their opinions on the appropriate and immediate course of action. Years following this event, various writers "discovered" the so-called "House of Decision"—in four conflicting locations, each close to General Washington's own headquarters. There is no shred of evidence, however, that Washington ever went near any farmhouses in which his officers were billeted. An examination of his correspondence indicates that up to mid-day of December 23 he had not decided on a course of action. It was not until late that evening that Washington announced his orders to return to New Jersey and fight. It was at this time that George Washington unhesitatingly took up the challenge and launched the ten-day "enterprise," ten days of courage and heroism, ten days that ripped the tide from defeat to victory, ten days that changed the world for Freedom.

The ten-day epic began with the recrossing of the Delaware on the night of December 25. Historians do not know definitely whether the Commander-in-Chief crossed by ferry, which is more likely, or in a Durham boat. One thing is certain to students of Washington; regardless of the type of craft used, he was certainly not concerned with his own appearance nor was he at all mindful of being a posing figure while General John Glover's Marblehead mariners were working to keep the craft on course through the floating ice. Later artists who have tried to recreate the scene in various media have failed to capture the real character of the man leading the expedition through the stormy night.

On the second day, December 26, Washington defeated the surprised Hessians at Trenton, taking more than 900 prisoners and inflicting some 20 to 30 casualties on the enemy with only two Americans dead and three wounded. On the 27th he returned to his Newtown, Pennsylvania camp, but recrossed the river to Trenton three days later, on the 30th, to join Colonel John Cadwalader's brigade on Assunpink Creek. In the battle of January 2, 1777, General Howe cornered Washington's army on the Creek and was ready to "capture the Fox" and finish the rebellion in the morning. Washington fooled the enemy and "escaped the Hounds" by leaving a small contingent at camp, with fires burning, and led the main force to outflank and defeat the British at Princeton on the last day of his enterprise.

This tenth day was Washington's finest hour.

At the critical moment after General Hugh Mercer was bayoneted near the Quaker Meeting House and Cadwalader's Philadelphia militiamen were fleeing with Mercer's men in a shameful retreat, the Great Washington rode into the "militia mob" and reversed the stampede, crying, "Follow me and hold fire." The Americans, observing their Commander-in-Chief, instantly turned and followed him through smoke and fire and heard him shout, "Bring up the troops. The Day is Ours!" This day was indeed ours—ours for Freedom.

The British in Nassau Hall at Princeton lay down their arms, and the tenth day terminated in glory for George Washington and eventually in ultimate victory at Yorktown.

RACE WITH CATASTROPHE

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, again it has been suggested that the Post Office be operated as a corporation, and this time the recommendation has been advanced by the President's Commission on Postal Organization, which has studied the continued deterioration of our postal service, despite the increased costs being borne by postal patrons. When this proposal was first advanced, Mr. Speaker, I expressed my strong agreement with this concept and urged that prompt and favorable action be taken to implement the formation of a postal corporation.

I am inserting in the RECORD the following editorial from the New York Times which reflects my views on this matter which is of real importance to every citizen of this Nation:

RACE WITH CATASTROPHE

With its technological and managerial sophistication, this country ought to be able to provide the best, rather than one of the worst postal services in the world. That dream probably could be realized if Congress enacted the substantive recommendations of the President's Commission on Postal Organization as set forth in the splendid report *Towards Postal Excellence*.

There is no secret about the fact that the United States Post Office is in a "race with catastrophe." In 1963 and again in 1966, to cite the most egregious examples, operation of the Chicago Post Office—world's largest postal facility—came to a complete halt.

The increasing volume of mail in this country, about 80 billion pieces this year, is moving more slowly than ever; fewer home deliveries are contemplated; postage rates go higher. The crisis is graphically summarized in the commission's statistics on postal productivity. In the private sector of the economy, a unit of capital and labor in 1967 produced 34 per cent more output than it did in 1958. But over the same 1958-67 period, the increase in mail service per unit of capital and labor was only 2.5 per cent.

Why did the efficiency of the private economy grow nearly fourteen times faster than that of the Post Office? The answer lies in the massive capital investments that embody new technology, the rising educational attainment of the labor force and advanced managerial practices. While the private sector forged ahead, the Post Office, with some notable exceptions, continued to operate very much as it did a century ago. It is at this

point, the failure to exploit new technology, that one comes to the heart of the problem.

The man charged with managing the postal service exercises virtually no managerial control: his title of Postmaster General carries with it powers that are about as circumscribed as those of a company commander. He has little or no power over the hiring or firing of personnel, the rates that are charged for postal services or over spending for new capital equipment.

The commission's solution is to vest a single authority with the powers necessary to provide an efficient postal service. It proposes the chartering of a Government-owned Postal Corporation empowered to hire and promote personnel on a nonpolitical basis, to determine rates of compensation according to competitive standards, to set postal rates, subject to Congressional veto, and to borrow money in the private capital markets for new postal facilities.

The commission's proposal that postal rates reflect the true cost of service would not necessarily preclude subsidies that may in fact be socially desirable. But if subsidies are to be granted, they should be through direct Government subvention, not by setting charges below the incremental cost of the service. The advantage of subvention is that it would be open to public scrutiny and be periodically subject to Congressional review.

Does the goal of postal efficiency conflict with the need to provide employment for people with little education and few skills, especially members of the disadvantaged, nonwhite minorities who are now attracted to the postal service? Not if the costs of sorting and transporting mail are drastically reduced through automation. The labor that is thus saved in post offices should make it economically feasible to employ more postmen for more frequent home deliveries.

The need to vest the power to manage the Post Office in a single authority is clear, and the Postal Corporation proposal advanced by Frederick R. Kappel and his colleagues seems promising. Instead of the non-committal comment it received from the President, it deserves strong support from the Administration, Congress and a public suffering under the intolerable postal system of today.

ADDRESS OF MR. DAVID BRADEN

HON. JOHN G. TOWER

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, recently Mr. David Braden, the outgoing president of the Oak Cliff Lions Club in Dallas, Tex., delivered an address to the members which I believe deserves special attention.

I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Last week as we met to have our Installation Party, a man assumed a station in a kitchen corridor in Los Angeles. Later that evening he shot and killed a U.S. Senator, Robert Kennedy, a candidate for the Presidency of this Nation.

The next day, as I contemplated this tragic and horrible event, it occurred to me that while spending a pleasant and amusing evening, I had done little then (or in this year for that matter) that you could wrap some serious thought around—I have left that to the guest speakers at this rostrum.

Blackie Sherrod, of the Dallas Times Herald, pointed out in his column of Monday evening that it is time for all those who have a podium to use it; be it a service club, or a sign on the back of a city bus. For two more weeks this is my soap box, and today I shall use it in a serious vein.

Lest I be remembered only as a clown, I would like to remind you today of the motto of Lions International: "Liberty, Intelligence, Our Nation's Safety." It is in that regard that I make this statement. I make it that someone might speak for the common man of this Nation: Who leads a common life; earns a common salary; has a common ambition; a common dream; and pays common taxes.

I speak to you as the forum of common men everywhere, and as a representative.

All America has been told this past week—over and over again—that we are a sick society.

Gentlemen, I propose to you that I am sick—maybe you are sick too.

I am sick to death of being told I am sick:

By Government officials who will not enforce law. . . .

By politicians who dance to the tune of minority groups;

By those in the pulpit and on the college lecture platform who use their office to project the socialistic creed of radicals.

I am sick to death of being told I am sick:

By idealistic aggressive news reporters and evaluators (of whatever media), who have the audacity to tell me I should believe whatever they believe—knowing I have no vehicle to publicly voice my disagreement.

I am sick of being told I am sick:

By foppish entertainers draped in Nehru jackets, feminine necklaces, and a cloak of pseudo intellectualism.

I am sick of cynical attitudes toward patriotism and our American institutions.

I am sick of sacrificing the cream of American manhood in political wars we are not fighting to win.

I am sick of the decline in integrity and personal honor in this nation.

I am sick of the permissive attitude, laxity, and tolerance to pressure groups and the criminal element that is bringing this nation to its knees in lawlessness.

I am sick of seeing law enforcement agencies and the laws of this nation emasculated by a supreme court and administrators who make their personal creeds the law of the land.

I am sick of dirty, unwashed, foul-mouthed—whether you call them hippies, beatniks, or pseudo poor people.

I am sick of not being able to take my family to a movie because it is loaded with extraneous offensive matter whose only purpose is to shock.

I am sick of seeing the same phrases in the popular literature of the day that I see scrawled on the walls of public toilets.

I am sick of so called educators and leaders too weak kneed themselves to understand the value of discipline in the character of a man.

I am sick of a congress which legislates out of emotionalism rather than reason, thereby taking away the rights of all.

I am sick of being told I am sick with violence because of assassinations by mentally deranged men, fed on a steady diet of violence and perversion by the nations periodicals, press, television and movies, all condoned, even aided, by courts which permit license in the name of freedom.

I am sick of riots, of marches, and those who force themselves and their ideologies down my throat without qualification.

I am sick of those who say I owe them everything, because of the sins of my forefathers, when I have looked down both ends of a machine gun barrel to defend them and their right to be here.

Take note gentlemen in high places, you will not see me in the streets with a plac-

ard or a gun; you will hear the thunder of the common man at the polling place, casting a vote for Liberty, Intelligence, Our Nation's Safety.

ON THE NONPROLIFERATION TREATY: AMEN, BROTHER

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1968

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, for months I have contended that the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty now before the other body for ratification has not been subjected to a cost-benefit analysis by this administration. I have repeatedly charged that the Nonproliferation Treaty has been approached as if it were motherhood and intrinsically good.

Now, Dr. William R. Kintner, deputy director of the Foreign Policy Research Institute at the University of Pennsylvania, has written an analysis of the Nonproliferation Treaty for the National Observer. His analysis concludes that the Nonproliferation Treaty is indeed full of loopholes which, if not potentially dangerous to the United States, at least would render the treaty meaningless.

Because of the importance of this issue to all Americans, particularly at this moment in history, I have obtained permission for Dr. Kintner's analysis to be set forth, as follows:

A FOREIGN POLICY ANALYST SEES TREATY PROBLEMS: HOW THE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION PACT MAY UNDERMINE NATO

(By William R. Kintner)

(Note.—William R. Kintner, who wrote this analysis, is deputy director, Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania. He is also professor, International Relations and Political Science Departments, at that university. He served 21 years in the U.S. Army and has been a member of the planning staff of the National Security Council. The nuclear nonproliferation treaty is now before the U.S. Senate for ratification.)

President Johnson, on the occasion of the signing of the nonproliferation treaty on July 1, called the treaty "the most important international agreement since the beginning of the nuclear age." The triple signature ceremonies in Washington, London, and Moscow brought to an end more than six years of diplomatic efforts.

Since January 1964, when the United States and the Soviet Union both proposed a nonproliferation agreement among the partial arms measures they presented at Geneva, each power has argued that such an instrument would serve the cause of international peace and stability. The United States frequently offered the following reasons as to why the nonnuclear states should continue to abstain from the nuclear course: (1) Expansion in the size of the nuclear club will further complicate the already complex problem of nuclear disarmament. (2) Such expansion would increase the risk of technical accident, unauthorized use, strategic miscalculation, or uncontrolled escalation from limited war, and thus make for a less stable world. (3) Small national nuclear forces are costly and detract from development. (4) Such forces are provocative, accident-prone, become obsolescent quickly, and lack both credibility and military utility.

No prudent statesman can blink at the fact that the atom has two faces—one warlike, and one peaceful. These two faces, like those of Janus, are very closely connected. The use of civilian nuclear reactors for gen-

erating electric power is expanding at a rate which makes some form of control appear imperative. It has been estimated that by 1980 their annual output, world-wide, of plutonium as a by-product will be in the neighborhood of 100,000 kilograms. This is enough to make about 15,000 "elementary" atomic bombs per year.

Paradoxically, the United States has done more than any other nation to facilitate the spread of technology and information that would make the proliferation of national nuclear weapons capabilities possible. This perhaps constitutes an important motive in the minds of those who deem a nonproliferation treaty a "matter of life and death."

SHAPING THE DECISION

Nevertheless, as the U.S. Senate now embarks upon a debate over ratification of this treaty, certain fundamental concepts of decision-making ought to be kept in mind. Decision-making in the political as in all other orders involves a weighing of probable gains and probable costs.

One of the difficulties of the public discussion of the treaty heretofore is that its advocates have been a bit too ardent. In their zeal, they have exaggerated the potential assets of the treaty while brushing its potential liabilities under the rug. Yet whether the nonproliferation treaty constitutes a net benefit to the United States and the Western alliance is something which should not be taken for granted but which ought to be discovered—if it is true—through a process of honest, intelligent inquiry.

American policy-makers should have sufficient humility to admit that what strikes them as a logical necessity might not compel the assent of all the non-nuclear states, nor even the small number of critical "threshold powers" whose assent the treaty has really been designed to obtain.

Three-score states subscribed to the treaty in Washington on the day of the signing, and others will undoubtedly approve it. Yet there are some politically important states which harbor serious misgivings over the present treaty.

WITHHOLDING AGREEMENT

Mr. Morarji Desai, the deputy prime minister of India, said that his country's decision not to sign the nonproliferation treaty in its present form was taken after mature consideration. Japan is also expected to take a long, hard look before reaching a decision. Authoritative sources reported that Israel, although approving the treaty in principle, was not yet ready to sign the document because of "certain reservations." The West German government indicated that it had no immediate intention of signing the treaty until a "whole series of problems," including East German harassment of access routes to West Berlin and several other East-West questions had been resolved. The position of each of these countries merits some attention.

India is generally regarded as the most likely new candidate for the nuclear club. Although India stands committed to atomic energy only for peaceful purposes, the Indian capacity to follow China into the realm of nuclear weapons is well known. India wants iron-clad guarantees from either the Soviet Union or the United States, or both, to protect her against any threatened Chinese Communist use of nuclear weapons against her, if India does not find satisfactory answers to her security problems. India may not sign the treaty and will keep open the option of developing her own nuclear weapons to neutralize the Chinese Communist nuclear threat. If India does not sign the treaty, it is unlikely that Pakistan will.

Officially, the Japanese have favored the nonproliferation treaty, but they advocate that the existing nuclear powers should take subsequent steps leading to the abolition of nuclear weapons. At the same time, Japan wishes to retain the option to develop its own nuclear explosives if it should wish to do so.

Such actions could result in Japan's acquiring a weapons capability.

Israel is another country that has both the technical means and a strong motivation for building nuclear weapons. There are many circumstances in Israel's strategic situation which logically dictate development of nuclear weapons. In this respect, she could not afford, even for a few days, to run second. Thus, although Israel voted for the resolution supporting the nonproliferation treaty in the U.N. General Assembly, she has felt compelled to hedge on signing.

If the United States tries to pressure Israel into signing the treaty, this country may have to pay a high price—a public bilateral security pact with Israel which might result in the more or less permanent alienation of the United States from the Arab world.

William C. Foster, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, long ago recognized the adverse implications which a nonproliferation agreement might have upon the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), and especially upon West German-U.S. ties, in a controversial article which appeared a month before this country presented a 1965 draft treaty to the Geneva Conference. In negotiating the nonproliferation treaty, the United States has seemed in the eyes of many knowledgeable Europeans to be placing the objective of promoting a *detente* with the Soviets ahead of alliance cohesiveness. Allied disagreements concerning the NPT reflect a growing awareness that there is now a certain incompatibility of United States foreign-policy objectives, all official denials to the contrary notwithstanding.

TWO VITAL INTERESTS

The United States, during the three-year course of the negotiations over the text of the treaty, made concessions to the Soviet Union which had a bearing on two vital interests of the European allies—nuclear sharing within NATO and the possibility of a European community deterrent. Both concepts, and U.S. support for them, were implicit in the text of the original draft treaty submitted by the United States to the Geneva Conference in August 1969:

"Each of the nuclear States Party to this Treaty undertakes . . . not to take any other action which would cause an increase in the total number of States and other organizations having independent power to use nuclear weapons [and] not to assist any non-nuclear State in the manufacture of nuclear weapons."

Given the wording of the article in the 1965 draft treaty it was possible to envisage the emergence of a joint European atomic deterrent in which one of the existing West European national deterrents (the British and the French) or both of them would be merged into a collective grouping. Nevertheless, after arousing the Europeans' interest in a NATO nuclear force and after advancing the "European option," the United States dropped both concepts from the text of its draft treaty.

In its final form, Article I reads:

"Each nuclear-weapon State Party to this Treaty undertakes not to transfer to any recipient whatsoever nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices or control over such weapons or explosive devices directly, or indirectly."

There can be no doubt that the compromises which have been struck, during the negotiation of the treaty, at the cost of pro-NATO and pro-European positions once held by the United States have had a most adverse effect upon the political mood of our major alliance system. There is every reason to believe that the Soviets have taken advantage of the protracted negotiations at Geneva in order to undermine the confidence of the West Europeans in the whole NATO structure.

For 19 years the destruction of NATO has been a major goal of Soviet foreign policy.

The alienation of West Germany from NATO has beckoned Soviet diplomacy as the most appropriate method for bringing about the collapse of the alliance and the withdrawal of U.S. power from Western Europe. The very efforts to negotiate a nonproliferation treaty have provided Moscow with the opportunity to deepen divisions within the Atlantic Alliance and increased the likelihood that no NATO nuclear force would ever be created. The Soviets have been given an indirect voice in future NATO strategic policy. Whenever the subject of nuclear sharing ever comes up again in NATO, the Soviets will be able to raise the treaty issue.

WEAKENING THE TIES

The fact that the United States, despite repeated assurances to the contrary, has accepted the nonproliferation treaty without the European clause is likely to strengthen those groups in Europe—especially in the Federal Republic—seeking to free themselves from heavy reliance on the United States. In Germany, the NATO guarantee will appear less and less relevant to German security. National solutions to the problems of German security may find broader appeal than ever before in the Federal Republic. The strengthening of rightist forces demanding national solutions is likely to call forth leftist opposition, thus increasing the polarization of German political life and the strains upon the still fragile political structure of the Federal Republic.

The fact must be faced that the greatest doubts about the nonproliferation treaty are to be found among some of the strongest European supporters of the NATO alliance, a fact that the Soviet government knows only too well.

According to Adrian S. Fisher, deputy director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the United States has taken the lead in developing the treaty: "We initiated the negotiations. We had to drag the Soviet Union to this." We are also the ones who insisted upon inspection and control safeguards. The inspection clauses of this treaty are much more relevant to U.S. objectives than to Soviet objectives. Article II of the treaty text, which was supposed to deal with international control and inspection, was for a time left blank because of differences over the watch-dog roles to be assigned to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom).

By January 1968, the United States and the Soviet Union had agreed to an inspection article, which is now in the treaty. There is considerable doubt, however, whether Article III provides for any more real inspection than the blank version of August 1967.

The Soviets insisted that if we demand inspection in the treaty, they would demand IAEA inspection for all non-nuclear weapons states. Yet for many years the Soviets would have nothing to do with the agency's safeguards system. The Soviets knew that by holding out for IAEA safeguards they would place the United States in an embarrassing position vis-a-vis our West German allies, who believed that Euratom inspection safeguards were quite adequate.

DELAYING THE AGREEMENTS

The final compromise on inspection in Article III says that parties to the treaty, either individually or in groups, "shall conclude agreements" with the Vienna Agency—negotiations to commence within 180 days from the treaty's entry into force and the agreements to enter into force no later than 18 months after the start of negotiations. In effect, the signatories would be promising to reach agreements *after* signing the treaty that they cannot reach *before* signing.

Only if negotiations with the IAEA are completed within two years after the nonproliferation treaty enters into force will

Article III be a binding international obligation upon the parties to the treaty.

Disregarding the legal uncertainty of the treaty's inspection clause, the question remains as to whether the IAEA has the capacity to conduct the inspection envisioned.

As to this point, Congressman Craig Hosmer has testified: "To speak of IAEA safeguards as something which exist and can be relied upon to enforce this treaty is ridiculous to the point of absurdity. Anyone familiar with the primitive capabilities, either technological or financial, of IAEA in the safeguards area knows this."

In a statement made in the July 1 signing of the nonproliferation treaty, President Johnson said:

"If a state which has accepted this treaty does not have nuclear weapons and is a victim of aggression or is subject to a threat of aggression involving nuclear weapons, the United States shall be prepared to ask immediate Security Council action to provide assistance in accordance with the charter."

STRETCHING THE UMBRELLA

If this statement means what it says, the United States nuclear umbrella will be expected to cover over twice as many nations as it now does. Yet how this broadened commitment is to be made credible has not been explained, except for the Security Council resolution of March 7, whereby the two superpowers recognized "that aggression with nuclear weapons or the threat of such aggression against a non-nuclear-weapon state would create a situation in which the Security Council, and above all its nuclear-weapon-state permanent members, would have to act immediately in accordance with their obligations under the United Nations Charter." What would happen if Moscow and Washington could not agree on what action should be taken, or which party was responsible for provoking a threat of aggression, can only be conjectured.

The draft treaty is also deficient in other important aspects. The obvious conflict between the Project Plowshare objective of using nuclear explosives for peaceful purposes and the provisions of the 1963 test ban is replicated in the draft nonproliferation treaty. Article V of the draft treaty has sought, with only partial success, to minimize the conflict between Plowshare and the nonproliferation treaty.

The difficulties created by Plowshare's objective appear to be more easily soluble in a framework of foreseeable arms control agreements than some of the other problems. The changes made in the treaty as a result of the U.S. debate "commit the nuclear powers more explicitly to provide peaceful nuclear assistance to non-nuclear treaty signatories. The non-nuclear countries are to be provided access not only to information but, as the Euratom countries have insisted, to 'equipment' and 'materials'—plus Plowshare explosions, when feasible." But if nations are to have access to nuclear explosives, why not to nuclear weapons? Furthermore, nuclear excavations which might be used to cut a sea-level canal across Panama will require revision of the partial test-ban treaty.

The draft treaty has also ignored the significance of certain scientific research with respect to the objectives of the treaty. This is particularly true of research on pure-fusion explosives; i.e., nuclear explosives that are devoid of fissionable materials. Article III of the draft states that "Procedures for the safeguards required by this Article shall be followed with respect to source of special fissionable material. . . ."

FUSION RESEARCH GOES ON

The nonproliferation treaty excludes fusion materials from inspection. Consequently, nuclear research on fusion techniques with potential weapons implications can go on under the treaty. S. T. Cohen of the RAND Corp. published a paper in 1967 which briefly

discussed the neutron bomb, related pure-fusion explosives to peaceful uses, and described pure-fusion explosive research being conducted under Euratom auspices at the Laboratori Nazionali De Frascati Del Comitato Nazionale Nucleare (Frascati, Italy). The implications the Cohen paper raised for the nonproliferation treaty and for the U.S. Plowshare program have been pointedly ignored by both the United States and the Soviet Union. In effect this neglect opens the door for any technologically advanced nation to develop pure-fusion explosives.

There may come a day when fusion explosives can be used for both peaceful and military purposes. Whether this development will occur during the proposed life span of the treaty is debatable. Nevertheless, the implications of this for nuclear-weapon proliferation may be great, and such research should have been taken into account in deliberations over the nonproliferation treaty.

The non-nuclear-weapon states outside the Atlantic world are deeply concerned over the future relationships between the nuclear-armed and the nuclear-naked. Their spokesmen contend that no treaty which perpetuates the division of the world into atomic lords and beggars can prove effective in the long run. They worry also about their future security. It gives many of them small comfort, in the wake of the failure of the United Nations to prevent the 1967 Middle East war, to hear the United States say it will counter nuclear blackmail under guidelines to be worked out by that body.

Rather than labor a universal nonproliferation treaty, the United States might have sought to halt the spread of nuclear weapons in other ways. For example, the United States could refuse to sell fissile material to nations outside Europe which refuse to submit their reactors to inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency. As a matter of fact, it has threatened to do so in order to pressure recalcitrant nations to sign the draft treaty. Without the treaty, Euratom could continue to inspect European power reactors. The United States has voluntarily agreed to IAEA inspection of its power reactors and in the absence of the treaty it could ask nations to whom it has furnished reactors and nuclear fuel to do the same. The Soviet Union has refused to subject its reactors to IAEA inspection.

The Soviet Union will not jeopardize in any way its relations with its Warsaw Pact allies by their adherence to the non-proliferation treaty. In fact, it is difficult to see any Soviet disadvantage from signing the treaty, except the oft-repeated argument that it will offend the Chinese Communist regime. It is doubtful, however, that this treaty will impair Moscow-Peking relations nearly as much as it has already harmed Washington-Bonn relations.

The Soviets are so happy with the treaty that they now dispute Adrian Fisher's assertion that it was made in the U.S.A. and claim its parenthood. As Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko asserted: "The draft treaty has been approved by the United Nations General Assembly, and the Soviet Union, as the initiator of the treaty, will be one of the first to sign it."

Despite its disputed parentage, the nonproliferation treaty will be effective only if it reflects a genuine international political consensus. The consensus supporting the treaty was brought about by heavy-handed U.S., Soviet, and British pressures which affronted many of the more important non-nuclear powers. A consensus so achieved is not likely to be very durable.

CHINA'S BACKING NEEDED

In the long run it will prove idle to hope that nuclear proliferation can be averted simply by a nondissemination agreement among three of the five existing nuclear powers. For one, Communist China would have to adhere to the treaty if it is to have any long-term validity. No international

treaty is likely to endure unless strong sanctions inhibit its abrogation. These do not exist. It can be abrogated in the future by nations, such as India, who believe that their own security requires the development of nuclear weapons.

Simultaneously with the President's announcement, Premier Kosygin in Moscow announced the following urgent measures for an end of the arms race in the near future:

1. A Ban on the use of nuclear weapons;
2. Measures on ending the manufacture of nuclear weapons, reducing and liquidating their stockpiles;
3. Limitation and subsequent reduction of means of delivery of strategic weapons;
4. Ban on flights of bombers, carrying nuclear weapons, beyond national frontiers. Limitation of zones of voyages of submarines carrying missiles;
5. Ban on underground tests of nuclear weapons;
6. Ban on the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons;
7. Liquidation of foreign military bases;
8. Measures on regional disarmament;
9. Peaceful uses on the sea bed and ocean floor.

It should be noted items 1 and 2 are standard Soviet propaganda ploys, that the limitation and subsequent reduction of strategic weapons was listed as number 3, and that items 4, 5, and 7 are specifically directed against the United States and item 8 is directed against Israel. The hope, therefore, of reaching agreement on arms-control measures that might be negotiated following the ratification of the nonproliferation treaty should be tinged with caution.

HON. HENRY H. FOWLER, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, DEDICATES GAINESVILLE, GA., NATIONAL BANK BUILDING

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.
OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 15, 1968, an impressive crowd gathered in Gainesville, Ga., to witness the dedication by Secretary of the Treasury, Henry H. Fowler, of the new, beautiful, Georgia marble bank building erected by the Gainesville National Bank. As a member from Georgia of the House of Banking and Currency Committee, I had the honor of being invited to attend the occasion, along with the Honorable PHIL LANDRUM, who has most ably represented the Ninth District of Georgia for many years and in whose district the new bank building was built.

Among the invited guests and dignitaries were Georgia's State treasurer, Jack B. Ray; superintendent of Georgia banks, William M. Jackson; the president of the Independent Bankers of America, T. H. Milner, Jr., who is also president of the National Bank of Athens, Ga.; Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Joe Bowman, a native Georgian; and W. Ray Houston, president of the Georgia Bankers Association, from East Point.

Dr. Ed Shannon, of Gainesville, a director of the Gainesville National Bank, acted as master of ceremonies. Congressman PHIL LANDRUM welcomed Secretary Fowler to the dedication, and in introducing the Secretary pointed out the latter's wisdom and courage in exerting

the national leadership necessary to preserve the value of the American dollar both at home and abroad. It was pointed out that the oak podium from which the ceremony was being launched was the same one originally used when President Franklin D. Roosevelt came to Gainesville in the late 1930's to review rehabilitation after the disastrous Gainesville tornado and was the same podium used by President Lyndon B. Johnson when he also visited Gainesville in 1964.

After the address of Secretary Fowler, which I have found so noteworthy, I now ask permission to set it out in full below. Response and welcome were made by Oscar J. Lilly, president, and Ed Kimbrough, board chairman, of the Gainesville National Bank.

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE HENRY H. FOWLER, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

It is an honor and a pleasure to be in Gainesville this afternoon.

It is an honor because the implied approbation of the kind of people who run banks is something I cherish both personally and as Secretary of the Treasury. And it is a pleasure simply because Georgia is the kind of place one likes to visit and Georgians the kind of people one likes to call friends.

However, there are additional reasons for my being here—aside from the honors and pleasure. One is that your able and, outstanding Congressman who is my very good friend, Phil Landrum, asked me to come to Gainesville. Now I know you all here are familiar with the distinguished record of Congressman Landrum and with the high esteem in which he is held in Congress. But he also happens to be a key member of the House Ways and Means Committee, the most powerful committee in the House, whose jurisdiction includes much of our national economic and financial policy. So, in so far as analogies to the present situation may be appropriate, you may assume that Phil is a key member of the Board of Directors to whom the Secretary of the Treasury must look for authority and support to do his job in paying the nation's bills.

As I contemplated coming to Gainesville, it seemed particularly fitting and symbolic for a Secretary of the Treasury to participate in the dedication of a fine new bank building. I notice my other Cabinet colleagues participating in the launching of facilities created by public funds—a school, a highway, power dam, park, a space center, or a defense project.

But a Secretary of the Treasury can enter more enthusiastically in the spirit of things by helping to launch an enterprise such as the Gainesville National Bank—that will house and secure the people's private savings—that will help put those savings to work in supplying goods and services for a people with the highest and most rapidly advancing standard of living in the world—that will facilitate the creation of new jobs, and more incomes and profits.

For a Secretary of the Treasury never forgets that it is by siphoning a fairly good cut of that flow of funds through the banking system in the form of taxes and borrowings that he is able to pay the bills for the United States Government.

Indeed I can think of no institution more fundamental to our way of life in the sense of complete identification with the progress and well being of the people of a community—a local, state or national community—than the banks that serve it. We simply cannot manage without them.

Moreover, there is no question in my mind that the nation's banks are a cardinal element in the prosperity and productivity of these United States. First of all, of course, our banks are the repository of our savings—and thrift is still one of America's foremost

virtues. Let no one suggest that Americans have forgotten how to save, not when the nest egg they have husbanded in time and savings accounts in commercial banks increased from \$57 billion in 1957 to \$185 billion in 1967, a rise of 224 percent.

But primarily, I suppose, our banks are so plainly among the great sinews of the economy because they are such effective instruments for the responsible utilization and diffusion of credit. It is no accident that when the management of the international development finance organizations such as the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank and our own foreign aid officials begin making loans and giving advice to poor nations on how to develop their economies, the creation of the machinery of credit is among the highest priorities. We Americans learned that lesson well when our own country was itself poor and undeveloped. The creation of an effective dual banking system in which a national banking system vies with state banking systems to effect the most efficient, secure and yet dynamic means of handling money and credit has made our miraculous development possible.

But neither should we forget one of the great intangible benefits that America's banks bring to communities both large and small, to Main Streets no less than Wall Street. By which I mean the prominent examples banks set or, if you like, the so-called "image" they project to most people. For to me banks as they are managed in this country stand for the great attributes of integrity and responsibility, of meaning what one says, of doing what one promises, of accepting the consequences of one's actions.

And finally let me say in praise of the managers of the great national network made up of banks like this one that they have surely kept up with the times in the matter of how their services are purveyed. The day happily is gone when the status of banks seemed to depend on the size of the pillars out front, the massiveness of interior grillwork hiding the almost anonymous people who worked inside, and the sense of solid impregnability conveyed by the great safe at the rear to which admission was reserved only to those initiated into some arcane rite. Today's bankers have taken banking to the people and both have profited. The trend that has created attractive and functional facilities like the one we are dedicating this afternoon is all to the good.

But banks, after all, are not ends in themselves. They only serve an end, which is to help make our economy work. And in the final analysis it is the state of the national economy that largely determines what we find in our pay envelopes, the price and quality of what the money will buy, and the security and durability of our savings.

So let us pause a moment and draw from recent history some conclusions that will light our way along the best future path.

The points I want to make are four in number:

First, that the United States is enjoying—right now, today—the longest and most materially rewarding period of sustained prosperity in the history of any nation.

Second, that although the basis of this growth is the energy of Americans and the productive capacities they have created and mastered, it did not take place automatically. It occurred because of the responsible partnership of government and the private sector—business, labor, agriculture and finance—and because of consciously adopted policies and programs that worked.

Third, that there is a consensus among economists and the fraternity of economy-watchers as they peer down the road ahead that this growth can continue if we continue to utilize and adapt these policies to the demands of the times, observing the priorities

that must be observed lest in an effort to do too much at once, we overstrain our capacity.

Fourth, Americans have made this progress that is the envy, example, and ambition of the rest of the world—despite comments of frustrated office seekers and unfriendly critics in foreign capitals—by a renewed national dedication as a people to our ancient national goal handed down by the founding fathers in the Preamble to the Constitution—and that effort must continue. We have used and are using, actively and with vigor, the instrumentality of our federal system of government to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. As a nation in this decade of the 60s, we are facing up to and tackling our problems at home, not hiding them under the rug. As a nation we are accepting the share of international responsibilities that is consonant with our position of leadership and strength in an interdependent world and the harsh but established fact of history that tranquility abroad, as well as at home, cannot be insured unless there is law and order, wholesome respect for the rights, security and property of others, and shared opportunity.

Going back to my first point, what, then, are the dimensions of the sustained prosperity which as I talk is well into its 89th consecutive month?

Ten million new jobs were opened up in the last eight-year period.

In 1961 the national rate of unemployment was seven percent. By 1966 it had been moved down to four percent, and has remained generally at that rate, or below it, ever since.

In 1961 there were 30 major labor market areas in which unemployment was 9 percent or more. Today, there are only two such areas.

American income—money after taxes and allowing for price increases—has gone up 40 percent in the past eight years.

In terms of current prices, the value of the amount added to our Gross National Product in the period since 1961 is \$320 billion. This national product gain of \$320 billion in the United States since 1961 is more than the total national product in 1966 of the United Kingdom, France, and Italy. It represents an average annual rate of growth of about 5.2 percent, as opposed to a rate of a little over 2 percent in the late fifties, when there was concern about a stagnant economy.

Prices in the past eight years have averaged an annual rate of increase of 2 percent. And this price record has been accomplished during a war, and without price controls, wage controls, rationing, material controls, or any of the other red-tape-creating controls you'll remember from Korea and World War II. Among the 21 industrialized nations which make up the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the United States has had the best record of price stability since 1961. Since 1961 prices have risen 15 percent in the United States. In the other 20 nations of the OECD prices have risen 38 percent since 1960.

Now these recent achievements contrast very strongly with past history in one more very important respect. The past eight years constitute a period of unbroken economic prosperity unmarked by the recessions that had come to be expected as inevitable.

Why was this? How has the new record been achieved?

The key factor has been the flexible use, over the past eight years, of fiscal and monetary policies to give direction to the economy.

In 1962, 1964 and 1965, the Congress enacted tax reductions totaling about \$24 billion at present levels of income.

An oppressive permanent tax rate structure was broken down. A web of highly discriminatory excise taxes was torn away from the economy.

Rules of depreciation of old machinery and plant equipment was liberalized.

Investment credits—tax credits to industries which invested in new plants and new equipment—were provided as an incentive to the economy.

All these things meant that American industry was enabled to work—and I repeat, in a free market economy, without the harassment of oppressive taxation and controls—to create new and better products; to sell them at competitive prices; to use more people, opening up new jobs; to raise living standards.

The year 1966 brought, with these accomplishments, a new set of economic and financial challenges which were basically problems of a prosperity that bordered on the excessive, a military operation that created new imbalances in the budget and balance of payments, and an unsustainable boom in one segment of the economy—the capital goods area—that strained the system.

The most notable economic achievement in 1966 was our ability, in the framework of a free market economy, to withstand the demands and dislocations of the Vietnam conflict and increased civilian needs without resort to the harsh economic controls imposed during previous military involvements.

Vigorous monetary and fiscal actions—both general and selective—combined with continued record-breaking increases in employment and high modern production facilities—made it possible for the nation to shoulder all these burdens.

Price pressures and credit demands, which reached a peak late in the summer of 1966, abated and the nation experienced a return in late 1966 and early 1967 to more stable price movements, more relaxed financial markets and some lowering of interest rates.

As you all know, in the late summer of 1967 the cessation of a sharp inventory readjustment downward combined with a continuing upward creep of military outlays and a rapid expansion in consumer purchasing power and a resumption of strong activity in the housing sector combined to present a new test to our national will.

We were challenged to forge new policies designed to pay the nation's bills and order our economic and financial affairs in such a manner as to reverse sharply a trend toward increasing deficits in our Federal budget and in our international balance of payments, increasing interest rates and an unacceptable degree of inflation with a wage-price spiral.

The strength and stability of the dollar and the economic system on which it was based was threatened. And all the world watched with bated breath to see whether or not the United States was capable of acting decisively to remove this threat to its national prosperity and the international monetary system which is so dependent upon the dollar.

The indicated instrumentality was the imposition of fiscal restraint in the form of a tax increase plus federal expenditure reductions—both symbols of declining expectations that are unpopular and unwelcome.

What was at issue was nothing less than a test of representative government in the vital but too little understood world of economic affairs. The decisive votes taken last month when the Congress approved the legislative package that contained both a temporary 10 percent tax surcharge and substantial reductions in Federal appropriations and expenditures—both unpopular measures in an election year—should go far to sustain confidence in the dollar, the economy on which it is based, and our system of government.

It took courage and foresight for President Johnson to initiate these tax proposals and to insist month after month that they be adopted.

It took a high sense of public responsibility for leaders of the business and financial community to put the public weal above short-run personal and corporate interest and urge that their taxes be increased in the national interest.

It took courage for the Members of Congress who voted for this measure. They deserve and should receive the appreciation of their constituents for demonstrating a high sense of fiscal responsibility and being willing to displease some of their constituents rather than harming all of them.

It took the give-and-take that characterizes our system of separation of powers, particularly in fiscal affairs, to arrive at a package that fully satisfied none but was acceptable to all—to the Administration and to both Houses of the Congress—the tax writing committees and appropriation committees—and the responsible leadership of both parties as represented in the Congress.

We are used to crunches and crises in this country. They are part of the democratic process. My point is that, although obtaining passage of this needed measure of fiscal restraint was something of a serialized cliff-hanger, the enactment was a victory for representative democracy as well as responsible free enterprise capitalism. And I also entertain the hope that in the process we learned a good deal more about fiscal policy and our economic system and the importance of a strong sound dollar to the world as well as the United States.

Now that we have the legislation and the policy that will arrest the excessive demand pressures on our economy that give rise to unwelcome inflation, and the government has put its house in order, it is incumbent upon business and labor to exercise the voluntary restraint in wage-price decisions that will reduce the cost-push type of inflation. Both anti-inflation approaches are needed to enable the economy to return to the pattern of stability in costs and prices that characterized the first half of this decade.

Moreover, we must continue to act firmly and courageously to correct our international balance of payments account as we have in dealing with our domestic deficit, but hopefully with greater dispatch.

We must stop spending more overseas than we take in. We must cut down—not necessarily on going abroad, but on the number of dollars per day we spend while abroad. We must more effectively promote foreign tourism in the United States.

We must reduce government expenses overseas or neutralize their impact by reciprocal action by the countries in which they are expended.

We must hold down temporarily on financing capital investments abroad from U.S. dollars.

Most important, we must boost sales of our products abroad and restore an increasing competitive advantage by returning to stability in costs and prices.

And, in this connection, while I have dwelt at a little length on the recent history of the domestic economy, I must remind you that America also has a role of leadership to play in the vital field of international monetary affairs. While we were meeting our responsibilities to put our own economic house in order we also were working with other nations to modernize the international monetary system that has served America and the Free World so well since the Bretton Woods agreement in 1947 in the greatest era of expanding trade and development in recorded history.

There is not time today to discuss the extended negotiations among the chief trading nations that are leading to the creation of those Special Drawing Rights in the International Monetary Fund. This new facility, hopefully, will be operable early next year and can be expected to lead to orderly expansion of reserves for which traditional reliance on monetary gold, the dollar and the British pound sterling has for some years appeared patently inadequate.

I shall simply content myself in saying that with patient hours of persuasion and bargaining at an extended series of international financial conferences, with the

understanding and ultimate approval of the Congress, and with the foresight and good will of our principal financial partners, the basis for continued sound expansion of world trade and development in which we Americans have a large stake, has been wisely laid.

It was my privilege this morning before leaving Washington, acting as the United States Governor of the International Monetary Fund, to sign and transmit the official certification that "The Government of the United States of America accepts the proposed amendment to the Articles of Agreement of the International Monetary Fund approved by the Board of Governors on May 31, 1968, and Resolution No. 23-5, and undertakes all of the obligations of a participant in the special drawing account in accordance with United States law and has taken all steps necessary to enable the United States to carry out these obligations."

This act authorized by the Congress and the President makes the United States one of the first countries on record officially approving this new and significant improvement in the international monetary system.

But again I must make my point that the international monetary system, like the U.S. economy, will not run itself. Like the domestic economy, it too must be the object of our closest study, and wisest and most timely action. For inaction by a leader, as someone has rightly said, is also a kind of action. And it leads, on the record, to disaster. Yet no one single act, such as the creation of a Special Drawing Rights facility, will suffice.

That is why one of the greatest assets for people everywhere—in the United States, in the developed countries, in the less developed countries—is the increasing capacity and disposition for international financial cooperation which emerged in the wake of World War II and has been greatly intensified in recent years. For we are witnessing and participating most actively in a quiet offensive to strengthen the institutions and patterns of conduct that make this international financial cooperation viable and effective.

The action and attitudes of the Central Banks and governments represented, which were reflected in the communiques of meetings in Washington on March 17 and in Stockholm on March 30, have opened the way for a thoughtful and considered approach to the future role of gold in the international monetary system based on the present official price of \$35 an ounce. There are fruitful areas for further exploration which become inviting in a monetary world where Special Drawing Rights and a more effective or acceptable adjustment process for payments imbalances are a reality. Moreover, these accords in March and April strengthened the close cooperation between governments as well as between Central Banks to stabilize world monetary conditions.

During the past week the Central Banks of the major financial nations, with the support of the governments involved—including the United States—have taken new, important and imaginative initiatives designed to shore up and stabilize the financial situation of two important countries and currencies, Britain and the pound, France and the franc.

Now, if we are watchful and wise and decisive, if we do all that we should do, what can we expect to happen to that pay envelope, and what its contents will buy, which I mentioned earlier? The consensus among private economists, I am happy to say, is that the future is indeed bright. What they think may be fairly summarized thus:

By 1975 the Gross National Product may reach \$1 trillion—which I will tell you, before you check the dictionary, is one thousand billion dollars. This means, among other things, that the average yearly income of the U.S. family can be on the order of

\$10,000 in terms of today's buying power—compared to about \$7,500 in 1967. It also means steady growth rates for our economy of up to 4½ percent annually, and the continued status of the dollar as the world's strongest and most stable currency.

But, as I have tried to say, there is a very large IF written plainly on this prediction and it has been expressed by, among others, the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress which, in presenting the projections I have used, said, and I quote:

"This higher rate of growth will not be achieved automatically, but will require improvements and adjustments of economic policies, both public and private, if it is to be achieved in a manner that does not generate undesirable inflationary by-products."

I come to the fourth and final point.

It is not enough for a national government to promote economic and financial policies designed to assure an economic environment in which our economy can flourish—however fundamental that task may be to all else.

The Founding Fathers desired an active, energetic federal system in areas other than commerce. They were dissatisfied with the passive and negative pattern of the Articles of Confederation.

They established a federal system—that included a strong national government of granted powers—to achieve objectives set forth in the Preamble of the Constitution—to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

Today, this nation under the leadership of President Johnson, with the support of an effective Congress, is using that federal system actively and with vigor to achieve these objectives. And that effort must be continued. There must be no retreat. There must be priorities. We cannot do everything at once. But there is a vast difference between priorities and paralysis.

We are using and must continue to use the federal system—the active cooperation between the national government and State and local bodies—to provide more effective law and order and a deeper and more abiding respect for the rights, security and property of others. Without these the nation cannot establish the full justice and assured measure of domestic tranquility contemplated by the founding fathers. These are fundamental to conserving the progress the nation has made for most, and broadening the participation to include all.

But that is only one side of the coin. Without a sharing of ever increasing opportunity that is implicit in the promotion of the general welfare, we will not achieve at home the full measure of these constitutional objectives.

That is why we have undertaken and must continue action programs by the national government, working in conjunction with state and local authorities, to improve elementary and secondary education, and to assist our higher institutions in providing an opportunity for every young American who wants and is capable of using a college education.

That is why the nation has undertaken and must continue an effective program of Federal, state and local cooperation for improved health facilities, including Medicare for the aged and Medicaid for the helpless.

That is why we must bring the opportunities for home ownership and suitable housing conditions to those elements of our society who in past years have not shared this opportunity.

That is why we are tackling and must continue to tackle the problems of poverty—not by a dole or outworn welfare systems—but by increasing the opportunities for training and developing the attitudes that are conducive to securing and holding a good paying job—and mobilizing an enlight-

ened private business community to see to it that the job opportunity follows the training.

That is why we are tackling and must continue to tackle through Federal, state and local cooperation, the new and emergent problems of life in the heart of our great cities—with the zeal and skill that we brought in the Thirties to making life on the land more productive and rewarding.

And let no one mistake the fact that the objectives embodied in the Preamble to our Constitution must have a validity in the international as well as the national sphere.

There must be in the world at large an increasing pattern of law an order that involves the wholesome respect for the rights, security, and property of other nations. Otherwise the blessings of liberty we are seeking to assure for ourselves and our posterity, and the peace in the world that is complementary to domestic tranquility at home, will be threatened.

This nation has sought and is seeking today—through the peace-keeping machinery of the United Nations, through regional alliances, through the practice of direct diplomacy—to make its contribution to the march toward world peace through security, order, and respect for the rights of others.

We have helped arrest aggression and the use of violence or the threat of violence—open or concealed—to destroy freedom and self-determination of countries large and small—in two world wars, in Iran, in Greece, in Turkey, in Berlin, in Korea, in Lebanon, in Taiwan, in the Congo, in Laos, in India, in the Middle East.

And now we are carrying on in South Vietnam.

And we must not let those, who would beat a retreat, thereby rewarding and encouraging aggression and violence, speak for America.

But again that is one side of the coin of achieving peace and security in the international sphere. The other side is again the sharing of increasing opportunity. We are using and must continue to use our influence and wealth, our hands and our hearts, in a dedication to shared opportunity in an interdependent world, that promises a large-scale attack on poverty, illiteracy and disease.

We have sought and struggled to make these concepts universal within the framework of the United Nations and outside it. We are providing direct aid. We have encouraged, provided leadership for, and sought to expand the cooperative effort of all the developed nations to promote, through multilateral development organizations, for the less developed nations, the progress and stability essential to meeting the needs and demand of their people. We must continue that effort. Just as we cannot turn our backs on aggression and the challenge to national self-determination in Southeast Asia, so we cannot turn our backs on our responsibility to participate in the development of other less fortunate countries.

That is why the notion of a moratorium on foreign aid or a refusal to replenish the funds of a successful multilateral institution, such as the International Development Association of the World Bank, would be a drastic retreat from responsibility.

If these remarks of mine have conveyed the idea that these are difficult times and that their challenges are very great, this is no less than the truth. But I would remind you that these United States are within a decade of being two hundred years old and that their Constitution is perhaps the oldest written document governing a modern nation. Which is merely another way of saying that we achieved the heights we occupy by addressing and solving problems that in their time loomed as large as any that confront us now.

I, for one, am proud today to be an American—living in a free society, that is

tackling its problems at home and helping to promote security and development abroad.

It is up to us whether we build upon this heritage, reaping the benefits of this course while savoring its high adventure, or supinely rest upon it to take the usual consequences of irresponsibility.

AMERICA IS AWAKE

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

AMERICA IS AWAKE

(By the Reverend Robert B. Watts, LL.D., D.D.)

(NOTE.—Dr. Watts is a lawyer, having been a Federal prosecutor, General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board and Vice President of General Dynamics Corporation; a Priest of the Episcopal Church; and a widely travelled speaker on Americanism.)

(For three consecutive years he has been awarded the George Washington Medal by The Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge "for outstanding achievement in bringing about a better understanding of the American Way of life": 1966, for "The Armour of God"; 1967, for "The Sound of the Trumpet"; and 1968, for "The Just Cause.")

He is a biographee listed in "Who's Who in America.")

The Holy Scriptures are full of words of warning, of prophecy and of bugle-clear exhortation.

One example of such exhortation, filled with a sense of the urgency of the hour, is to be found in the 13th Chapter of St. Paul's Letter to the Romans. He wrote—in words perfectly tuned for America today, "*now it is high time to awake out of sleep—The night is far spent, the day is at hand: let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armor of light.*"

In this month which marks the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of our Country, I say to you, my fellow countrymen, that America has indeed heeded these inspired words. For America is awake!

She has suffered agonies through the long night. She has struggled with the works of darkness. But now the day is at hand. She is wide awake to her danger, and she has buckled on the armor of light—of truth—of understanding and of determination. And in the words of St. Paul, "It is high time" that this has come about. Particularly after the past three years, since outbursts of rioting, looting, destruction and what Governor after Governor has characterized as "armed insurrection" have spread smoldering ruins over city after city, perhaps it is time to look again at this incredible experience which has been America's.

Long ago, concerned persons—and I am one of them—pointed out that the pernicious doctrine of obeying only those laws which happened to please each individual was the cause of much of this shocking violence. This doctrine was dressed up under the name of "non-violent civil disobedience"—and as such deceived many of the naive "pseudo-intellectuals" and clergy, who saw in it only a show of protest over one kind or another of asserted evil.

And so among others we saw various members of the clergy joining others of all sorts and conditions in public picketing, marching and in loud assertions that the law of the land was no longer to be controlling.

The people of America, the great bulk of

whom had been brought up to be decent, law-abiding citizens, saw and heard this uproar—and were confused and all too often rendered quiescent about it because of their instinctive respect for those who now openly defied any law which they disliked. Meanwhile, new slogans such as "police brutality" were being created and cast at the sworn guardians of the peace until they were so ridiculed, suspected and attacked as to be put on the defensive. It mattered little that these charges and these slogans were almost always false—that upon close inspection they turned out to be complaints about such things as "disrespectful remarks" allegedly addressed to citizens apprehended in the very act of committing violations of the law.

Inevitably, this twin campaign of disdain for law and unrelenting accusation of peace officers of every type, diligently fostered and encouraged by those who seek to destroy our Nation, brought forth its aftermath of increasing crime. Once assured of relative safety from prosecution, the law of the jungle emerged, rendering no one safe in person or property.

Violent crimes increased to almost unbelievable proportions. Official statistics of the Federal Bureau of Investigation recently furnished to Congress show that from 1960 to 1967, recorded crimes in the United States rose by 88 percent. Violent crimes went up 72 percent. And property crimes increased by 90 percent. The official figures for the first three months of 1968 show steady rises in crime over the rates for 1967. "The violent crimes of murder, forcible rape, robbery and aggravated assault as a group rose 18 percent." Nor can these chilling figures be explained away, as has been attempted, by asserting that this increase in crime merely reflected an increase of population; for in the seven year period which these official statistics cover, population in the United States increased by only 10 percent.

The difference was the result of disdain for law, and let us never forget it.

But that disdain of law is now being recognized in America. Ordinary people are realizing that the very reason for having any government is to protect the safety of all by requiring all to respect the rights of others as provided by government. Men and women are telling their office-holders and their peace officers that they want and expect the laws to be applied to everyone equally. And they are saying that the carnival days for criminals are over.

The "innocent ones"—the parading clergy, the "pseudo-intellectuals" and the "go-alongers"—are getting the message. For one thing, they are frightened by the monster which they helped let loose. And again, the fun of marching is largely gone. Sense in government is returning.

But like the measles, the itch to be in the public eye is hard to control—and very contagious.

So we all have had to suffer through the small-boy nose thumbings against our most sacred beliefs and possessions. "God is dead," was the new shout, and again "the innocents" followed along—ready to concede that centuries-old truths held by the Church were probably now outmoded. Like the manufactured cry of "police brutality," the expounders of the new heresies (all still clinging tightly to their clerical collars and livings) soon began to admit that perhaps God wasn't really dead, or wholly dead, but that they had just lost sight of him in the excitement of the world. Some have continued to assail our faith. One Bishop has not only publicly jettisoned Christ, and all of the Creeds of his own church, but also the Bible—and goes about lecturing on what he calls "facts"; meanwhile dabbling in the occult and describing to a fascinated press his experiences with mysteriously moved physical objects. But "the innocents have largely smelled the 'works of darkness.'" They

have found themselves again "put on," and are already off on other pursuits.

"Academic freedom" and "freedom of speech" next sounded enticing notes, and attracted the innocent activists to new areas of kleig lights and television exposure. All of us have been watching this syndrome.

From issues draped in academic trappings, the unwary soon found themselves again being manipulated—this time to support wild and unrestrained demands for literal control of our great universities. These demands were followed by physical seizure of university properties, brutal imprisonment of senior college personnel, and wanton destruction of records, personal effects and even the results of life-time intellectual inquiry.

Meanwhile, of course, in addition to the criminal actions involved, the rights of thousands of decent students to attend classes and the rights of hundreds of decent teachers to teach have been wholly ignored.

Tragically, many University faculty members and especially many well-paid graduate teaching assistants have been openly supporting, advising and encouraging these excesses.

American flags torn down and burned on our campuses have become all too common, as their places have been taken by flaunted enemy flags and piles of enemy propaganda. And all this in the plain view of the American citizens whose taxes pay for and support the whole state academic structure. Once again, "the innocents" smell trouble from an outraged America which has indeed awakened and is putting on its "armor of light"—and they are scampering to new areas of self-advertisement.

One of their latest enchantments has been in the area of basic obstruction of the selective service laws—upon which our Country has traditionally depended for the selection of its citizens whose service is needed for the support of the Government, in military or other tasks.

Let me pause here to comment upon how ridiculous it really is for physicians and clergymen—neither group weighted down by a particle of technical training in the law—to attempt to decide matters relating to the legality of these selective service statutes. How outraged these worthy innocents would be if a practicing attorney, devoid of medical or theological training, were to undertake to inject their patients with a drug, the name of which the lawyer fancied—to expound with asserted authority the most complex teachings of the Scriptures or the Church!

But to proceed. Here again the same inevitable excesses which have characterized the far spent night of our Country's darkness in so many other areas, have taken place. Witness, in shame, the convicted Chaplain of Yale University, branded a criminal by a jury of his peers for conspiring to interfere with laws relating to the defense of his Country. Look again and see that other convicted priest, already found guilty of criminal entry and the befouling of Government draft records with blood—and now caught again in similar aggravated criminal actions.

Where are "the innocents," while these revolting actions are fresh in mind? They are still holding meetings. They are learning about havens abroad for draft dodgers. Some have been hiding such draft dodgers in their churches. Others say that they want "to advise young men on the draft," to use one euphonious phrase. I suggest that if they aren't careful, some of these brethren will have the Bar Association on their necks for practicing law without a license—or, for that matter, without any legal knowledge.

Probably this phase is nearing an end, too. Once the sentences are announced on a few of those already convicted, the dupes will hear the ominous words "the day is at hand," and be off and running again.

Where will they turn up next? Who knows? And, indeed, in a very real sense, who now cares?

For the essence of this quick scanning which I have been doing is to make clear the point that these fitting leaders, these noisy breast-beaters, are no longer fooling America. They may continue to fool themselves for a time—but the solid majority of Americans has had about enough. That majority is no longer going to be fooled by trick phrases, or by the shrill cries of the publicity seekers.

America is awake! The majority of Americans believe in God—the Father Almighty and Creator of the Universe. They believe in His holy words as recorded in the Scriptures. They believe in their Government—the United States of America—and they are not about to let anyone, or any group, or any organization (no matter what they call themselves) strike down that Government.

The majority of Americans want everyone to have an equal opportunity to make of themselves whatever they can, and wherever they wish to do so. But they are not going to submit to threats, nor flinch before violence, nor surrender their rights to freedom in any of its forms.

They are willing to work. They are willing to pay taxes. They are willing to see that everyone who wants a job may have one. But they are not willing to support those who refuse to work when able.

The majority of Americans are sick and tired of the flood of crime in their cities. They love their families and their homes. And they are not going to let any vicious breed of criminals continue to roam their streets and spit at the law. And whatever it takes in force to achieve this most basic of all freedoms—the freedom to live peacefully—that force they will supply.

America is awake!

"The night is far spent, the day is at hand," and we see our fellow-countrymen "put on the armor of light."

As they do so, let us never lose sight of the dangers of which we are now aware. Let us pray, in Kipling's mighty words:

"Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!"

THE "PUEBLO" CREW

HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1968

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, 6 months ago this week the U.S.S. *Pueblo*, her officers, and crew were seized by North Korea. All attempts thus far to negotiate a safe return appear to have been futile. We cannot let these brave men think we have neglected them or that our resolve to obtain their release has weakened.

Therefore, it is an honor for me to join with many of my colleagues in the House in saluting the courageous men of the *Pueblo* for the sacrifices they have made in the name of their country.

I am prayerful for the *Pueblo* men and their families, who have been so deeply burdened in recent months, but I am equally proud of their valiant contribution to our mission of freedom.

If an apology to the North Koreans by the administration is necessary to secure the return of the crew, then I reluctantly agree that such an apology should be made. Any further delay must not be tolerated.

I, too, urge all concerned Americans to fly their flags this Sunday, July 28, in a tribute to the noble crewmen and their captain, Lloyd M. Bucher. It is essential

that we not forget them and the service they and all the individuals in our Armed Forces are rendering to the cause of this Nation and the freedom of all mankind.

We must remember them—with both pride and prayer—and make certain their safe return to the shores of this land without delay.

LAW, ORDER, AND THE HIGH COURT

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of Chief Justice Bell of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania seem very appropriate at this time. General dissatisfaction throughout our country with decisions reached by the present U.S. Supreme Court has been expressed on many occasions.

When a man of the stature, education, legal ability, and attainments of Justice Bell feels as he does concerning the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, it is my opinion that the people of our country should have the benefit of his vast knowledge and experience in this particular field. At this point, I include the article by Chief Justice Bell, taken from the U.S. News & World Report, dated July 22, 1968:

LAW, ORDER, AND THE HIGH COURT—A STATE CHIEF JUSTICE SPEAKS OUT

(NOTE.—Why the increasing disrespect for law and order in America? Are the rulings of the Supreme Court in recent years the cause of it all? A distinguished State jurist examines the problem—and suggests a course of action to help eliminate it.)

(Text of an address by Chief Justice John C. Bell, Jr., of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, to the District Attorneys' Association of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia, Pa., on July 8, 1968.)

The land of law and order—the land which all of us have loved in prose and poetry and in our hearts—has become a land of unrest, lawlessness, violence and disorder—a land of turmoil, of riotings, looting, shootings, confusion and Babel. And you who remember your Genesis remember what happened to Babel.

Respect for law and order—indeed, respect for any public or private authority—is rapidly vanishing. Why? There isn't just one reason. There are a multitude and a combination of reasons. Many political leaders are stirring up unrest, discontent and greed by promising every voting group heaven on earth, no matter what the cost. Many racial leaders demand—not next year, or in the foreseeable future, but right now—a blue moon for everyone with a gold ring around it.

Moreover, many racial leaders, many church leaders and many college leaders advocate mass civil disobedience and intentional violation of any and every law which a person dislikes.

We all know, and we all agree, that there is a need for many reforms, and that the poor and the unemployed must be helped. However, this does not justify the breaking of any of our laws or the resort to violence, or burnings and looting of property or sit-ins, lie-ins, sleep-in students, or mass lie-downs in the public streets, or the blockading of buildings, or rioting mobs.

Television shows which feature gun bat-

ties—of course, unintentionally—add their bit to stimulating widespread violence. Furthermore, the blackmailing demands of those who advocate a defiance of law and order under the cloak of worthy objectives, and commit all kinds of illegal actions which they miscall civil rights, are harming, not helping, their cause.

Let's face it—a dozen recent, revolutionary decisions by a majority of the Supreme Court of the United States in favor of murderers, robbers, rapists and other dangerous criminals, which astonish and dismay countless law-abiding citizens who look at our courts for protection and help, and the mollycoddling of lawbreakers and dangerous criminals by many judges—each and all of these are worrying and frightening millions of law-abiding citizens and are literally jeopardizing the future welfare of our country.

Is this still America? Or are we following in the footsteps of ancient Rome, or are we becoming another revolutionary France?

Let's consider some of these problems one by one. In the first place, we cannot think or talk about crime and criminals without thinking about the newspapers and other news media. Our Constitution, as we all remember, guarantees the "freedom of the press," and this freedom of the press means an awful lot to our country, even though it isn't absolute and unlimited.

We all know that newspapers are written, edited and published by human beings, and therefore it is impossible for a newspaper to be always accurate or always fair or always right. Nevertheless, the newspapers and other news media are terrifically important in our lives, and particularly in showing up incompetent or crooked public officials and dangerous criminals. Indeed, it is not an exaggeration to say that they are absolutely vital and indispensable for the protection of the public against crime and criminals.

No matter what unrealistic people may say, the only way it is possible for law-abiding persons to adequately protect themselves against criminals is to be informed of a crime as soon as it happens, and all relevant details about when and where and how the crime occurred, together with pertinent data about the suspected criminal or criminals.

I repeat, this is the quickest and surest way, although, of course, not the only way our people can be alerted and protect themselves.

For these reasons, it is imperative that we must resist constantly and with all our power, every attempt to "muzzle" the press by well-meaning and unrealistic persons who mistakenly believe that this press coverage with its protective shield for the public will prevent a fair trial.

I need hardly add that if the press publicity so prejudices a community that a fair trial for the accused cannot be held therein, the courts possess, and whenever necessary exercise, the power to transfer the trial of such a case to another county in Pennsylvania.

Let's stop kidding the American people. It is too often forgotten that crime is increasing over six times more rapidly than our population. This deluge of violence, this flouting and defiance of the law and this crime wave cannot be stopped, and crime cannot be eliminated by pious platitudes and by governmental promises of millions and billions of dollars. We have to stop worshipping Mammon and return to worshipping God, and we next have to change, if humanly possible, the coddling of criminals by our courts.

The recent decisions of a majority of the Supreme Court of the United States, which shackle the police and the courts and make it terrifically difficult—as you well know—to protect society from crime and criminals, are, I repeat, among the principal reasons for the turmoil and the near-revolutionary conditions which prevail in our country, and especially in Washington.

No matter how atrocious the crime or how clear the guilt, the Supreme Court never discuss in their opinions or even mention the fact that the murderer, robber or dangerous criminal or rapist, who has appealed to their court for justice is undoubtedly guilty, and they rarely ever discuss the rights and the protection of the law-abiding people in our country. Instead, they upset and reverse convictions of criminals who pleaded guilty or were found guilty recently or many years ago, on newly created technical and unrealistic standards made of straw.

Although I do not doubt their sincerity, most judges, most lawyers and most of the law-abiding public believe that they have invented these farfetched interpretations of our Constitution with a Jules Verne imagination and a Procrustean stretch which out-Procrustes; and either legally or constitutionally they must be changed!

Now, here is where you come in. The people of Pennsylvania need, as never before in our history, district attorneys who will without fear or favor act promptly, vigorously and, of course, fairly, to prosecute and convict the lawless, the violent and the felonious criminals who are alarming and terrifying our society. How can you do this? There are several ways which occur to me, and I am sure numerous additional ones will occur to you.

The first is: You must prosecute as quickly as possible all persons who violate any law, no matter how or under what cloak of sheep's clothing they may attempt to justify their criminal actions.

"NEWLY CREATED RIGHTS" OF CRIMINALS

Second: Study—and you will have to study as never before—all of the many United States Supreme Court decisions handed down in the last few years concerning crime and criminals, their confessions and their newly created rights. These are so numerous that I will not have time to analyze and discuss them. However, I will capsule my feelings with respect thereto by the following quotations from the dissenting opinions in *Wesberry v. Sanders* [on apportioning congressional districts so one person's vote is equal to another's] which said, *inter alia*: "... The constitutional right which the Court creates is manufactured out of whole cloth;" and in the dissenting opinion in *Lucas v. Colorado General Assembly* [on apportioning the Colorado legislature on the basis of population], where one of the dissenting opinions said:

"To put the matter plainly, there is nothing in all the history of this Court's decisions which supports this constitutional rule. The Court's Draconian pronouncement, which makes unconstitutional the legislatures of most of the 50 States, finds no support in the words of the Constitution, in any prior decision of this Court, or in the 175-year political history of our federal union. . . ."

In the very recent case of *Witherspoon v. Illinois*, which was decided on June 3 of this year, the dissenting Justices went even further, and said that the majority opinion was completely without support in the record and was "very ambiguous." With these conclusions I strongly agree.

However, what is more important is the question of what *Witherspoon* really holds. The majority opinion thus summarizes it:

"Specifically, we hold that a sentence of death cannot be carried out if the jury that imposed or recommended it was chosen by excluding veniremen for cause simply because they voiced general objections to the death penalty or expressed conscientious or religious scruples against its infliction. . . . Nor does the decision in this case affect the validity of any sentence other than one of death. Nor, finally, does today's holding render invalid the conviction, as opposed to the sentence, in this or any other case. . . . We have concluded that neither the reliance of law-enforcement officials nor the impact of a retroactive holding on the administra-

tion of justice warrants a decision against the fully retroactive application of the holding we announce today."

Third: You will have to more carefully and more thoroughly prepare your cases than ever before, especially on the question of the voluntariness and admissibility of confessions, in order to avoid new trials, now or 25 years from now.

WHY RECORDS ARE IMPORTANT

Fourth: You will have to personally make sure that a complete, detailed record is kept of all the trial and pretrial and postconviction proceedings in every case, in order to adequately answer and refute, immediately or many years after the trial, a convict's contentions that he was deprived of a number of his constitutional rights.

These allegations of unconstitutionality may include a contention that his confession or guilty plea was coerced or involuntary; or that he did not have a lawyer at the taxpayers' expense at the time of his confession, or any time to adequately prepare his case; or that he was not advised or did not understand all his rights at every critical stage of the trial and pretrial proceedings, including his right to remain silent; and all his other required constitutional warnings; or that he was not competent to stand trial; or that he was insane; or that his lawyer was incompetent; or that he was not advised of his right to appeal and to have a tax-paid lawyer represent him in his appeal; and also every imaginable lie which he can invent; as well as every technical defense which an astute criminal lawyer can, after the trial or after many postconviction proceedings, conceive.

Fifth: You will have to aid, of course, diplomatically, every trial judge, in order that his rulings and his charge to the jury and his statement of the law and the facts are accurate, adequate, fair and comply with all the recently created technical standards.

Sixth: And this is very, very, very important—I strongly recommend:

First, that your association state courteously and publicly the position of the District Attorneys' Association of Pennsylvania with respect to every decision of the Supreme Court of the United States and of an appellate court of Pennsylvania, which the association is convinced is unfair to our law-abiding people and is unjustified by the Constitution or by any statutory law, together with the reasons and the legal authorities which support your position; and that you simultaneously send a copy of all of the association's recommendations, resolutions and criticisms to the Supreme Court of the United States, and to the appellate courts of Pennsylvania.

Second, that each of you write, and likewise be sure to see the members of the State legislature from your district and your Congressman and your two United States Senators about the association's recommendations and resolutions and criticisms, and the reasons for the association's opinions and convictions.

Finally: You must fight with all your might and power and as never before for all the law-abiding people of our wonderful State who are consciously or unconsciously relying upon you and the courts to protect them from felonious criminals and from all law-breakers.

A FLAG FOR THE "PUEBLO"

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1968

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased that Members of the House

and the other body had an opportunity yesterday to greet Mrs. Lloyd M. Bucher, the wife of the captain of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*, during the reception held in her honor in the Longworth Building.

Mrs. Bucher's visit to Capitol Hill emphasized even more the widespread interest throughout the Nation in the welfare of the surviving 82 officers and crewmen of the *Pueblo*. Let me again express the hope that Americans everywhere will join in flying their flags in a salute to these courageous men next Sunday, July 28.

THE FORD FOUNDATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I received a booklet in the mail this morning that I would very much like to share with my colleagues. The booklet was published by the Ford Foundation and written by Mr. Gordon Harrison, program officer in charge of projects relating to our resources and environment.

Mr. Harrison's text provides as clear and concise a statement as I have seen on what conservation is about, and what conservationists are properly concerned with protecting. The point that he makes is that man survives and prospers because of his ability to disrupt his environment selectively—encouraging those things that are beneficial and weeding out those that are not. The correlative problem is that we are seldom aware of the long-range consequences of our activities until long after they have been set in motion; by that time it is often too late.

If there is a way to break out of this impasse, it lies in our ultimate ability to recycle our resources, restoring to nature those things which we have taken, used and discarded, in a manner that will permit their reabsorption into a useful and productive environment. The Ford Foundation is making a serious effort to point out areas in which society's efforts can be properly directed to this end, and the booklet provides a valuable insight into this effort.

I comment it to the attention of my colleagues, many of whom are very much concerned with the problems that this report describes.

THE ECOLOGICAL VIEW

Of all the creatures who over the eons have inhabited this planet, man has been unique in his ability deliberately to alter the environment.

One striking way in which he has done so has been to reduce disease by making the man-occupied world less hospitable for parasites and their insect transport. Technological success here has lowered death rates much faster than society could adjust to the implications. Hence, to simplify slightly, the world population began to grow cancerously.

In the unindustrialized world this sudden imbalance faces millions with starvation. Family-planning programs cannot achieve results quickly enough to avert the food crisis. Technical efforts to increase food

supplies, despite some dramatic successes, are too meager to do the job, and it is not certain that even an all-out effort could succeed. The typical conservationist approaches to warn of a developing imbalance between resources and consumption while trying both to save the resource and rationalize the patterns of consumption—these have little relevance at this late hour. Many observers believe that millions of people will starve in the 1970s, victims of our failure to recognize that we are not masters of the living system on which we depend for our life but parts of it, just as much as cells are parts of a body.

That lesson of folly is infinitely more tragic than any we face immediately in the developed world. We here are nevertheless pursuing a course that is similarly at odds with our circumstances aboard a small planet, similarly heedless of natural constraints on consumption, and therefore finally catastrophic as surely as if a man were to spend his days gorging himself without stop.

The most obvious symptom of our own approaching crisis is pollution. By pollution I mean not only the poisoning of air and water by the wastes of production but equally the splurge of metropolis, the needless engrossment of some of our most productive farmlands for suburban housing, and the cavalier destruction of landscape by strip mines, highways, power lines, billboards, as though man did indeed live by these alone. Pollution in this sense is often regarded like famine as another direct consequence of over-population, and there is no question that increased numbers of people and especially their concentration in urban areas have made pollution critical and highly visible. Pollution, however, is not caused by too many people. It is the result of human disturbance of the cycling of energy and materials in natural systems.

That cycle in outline is well known: Primary producers (chiefly green plants) with energy from the sun synthesize their own organic food out of carbon dioxide, water, and minerals. All other living creatures feed on these plants either directly by grazing or indirectly by grazing the grazers as carnivores or parasites. A part of the food eaten is excreted; all of it is returned in one form or another to the environment. The organic discard passing through a variety of scavengers is eventually broken down by bacteria into its inorganic components which are thus made available to the plants as raw materials once more.

Man's intervention is radically disruptive. When a farmer clears a wood and plows a field he functions with respect to nature like a natural catastrophe—indeed generally more effective than fire, earthquake, or tornado. He exterminates a system of interrelated plants and animal life which over a long period of time had become mutually adapted to the physical environment and to each other in such way that each creature was just making a living.

In a natural system, fully developed as in a primeval forest, for instance, the input of sunlight is used to maintain the community of organisms. While individuals come and go within it and populations of species fluctuate so that at times there may be more oak and less hickory or more mice and fewer owls, the total quantity of living matter remains constant; that is to say the system ideally yields no net biological product. Net biological product—a crop—however, is just what the farmer wants. He therefore destroys the balanced system and creates a deliberately unbalanced one whose cycle from plowed field to seed to crop to harvest and back to plowed field is completed in a single season. He does this essentially by simplification, suppressing on his farm as many of the living things as possible that would compete with his planted crop for energy and minerals. He weeds; he fences; he sprays against pests.

The result is a system that in nature's terms is disturbed. The excess product—the developing crop—represents unexploited environmental opportunities, or in the ecologist's jargon, unfilled niches. Pests arrive on the scene to take advantage of these unusual opportunities. Unlike men, they cannot cart away the crop; they can only multiply in numbers to consume it. If left alone they would make off with the feast and then move on, or starve down to numbers adapted to lower supplies of food, or provide a bonanza for predators who obeying the same law of nature might increase in their turn to exploit it. By many complicated interactions over time populations feeding on each other would come once more into balance. Balance of course is never a static condition but rather a moderated pattern of ups and downs around a mean, much like temperature fluctuations in a thermostatically controlled room, although immensely more complicated.

It is clear that the simpler a natural system is the more unstable it must be. Consider a three-part food chain: grass, rabbits, and lynx. Suppose drought destroys the grass crop. Then rabbits wholly dependent on it will die off and so will lynx who are wholly dependent on rabbits. But if among the grass were drought-resistant plants and rabbits were adapted to eat them, then at least a proportion of plants, rabbits, and lynx would be likely to survive prolonged dry spells. The system would be made harder still if chipmunks were added to feed on nuts and could be caught perhaps by more skillful lynx who would then not entirely die out for lack of rabbits but might produce a cleverer strain better able in the future to handle environmental adversity. In any event the more alternative ways there are of eating and being eaten the better the chance a living system has to avoid massive fluctuations in the birth and death of species. Variety thus appears to be nature's grand tactic for survival.

Man is the only creature who values wealth because only he can achieve it. An important consequence of the farmer's productive system is that it enables him to capture excess produce from the soil, more than he needs at once to consume. He can exploit that wealth by storing it and that leads to the settled life, to villages, and at last to cities. It is in permanent human settlements that off-premise consumption produces the specifically human problem of garbage and wastes. Waste is in fact only a symptom that geographically the metabolic cycle has been split: Production has occurred at one place, consumption and excretion at another. The byproducts of human use that would in nature return immediately as food for other organisms in the cycle are, as it were, left high, dry, and a nuisance out of their natural context. Civilization so far has been more impressed with the nuisance than with the anomaly that processes which on the land sustain life, in town can poison it.

Currently this nation devotes a lot of energy and money (though not nearly enough) to seeking a technological fix for the waste problem. So long as this technology explores essentially for more sophisticated holes in which to throw things away, it may be immediately useful in changing the locus of the nuisance—garbage is after all more tolerable on the town dump than in the bedroom—but in the long run it is doomed. Let it be noted again that all the materials by weight extracted and processed for human consumption are breathed away or end up as waste. The concepts of use and discard therefore are simply irrelevant to the facts of life within a system that is closed so far as materials are concerned. The traditional focus on production and consumption looks at only one segment of the indivisible circle: Consumption, if it is to continue, must be tied to production at both ends, accepting the product and giving up the raw materials for new products.

The problem of waste disposal is not the focal or even necessarily the most important issue for conservation, but it serves as well as any to illustrate the principles of interdependence that make it necessary for man in all regards to pay more attention to his impact on his environment and vice versa. The concept of the natural system, along with the recognition that nature has a tactic realized by maximum stability while man embraces an opposite tactic aimed at maximum production, provides the essential philosophical context within which it becomes possible to see what conservation can and cannot, should and should not do.

THE FOUNDATION PROGRAM

Wildlife and wilderness preservation

Someone has described a conservationist as one who wants more wilderness for more voices to cry in. An uncompromising defense of the wild is an ostentatiously minority view. From what has been said it is clear that preservation of nature as is directly frustrates man's tactics. It says to him: "Here in this place or with respect to this plant or animal you shall not gather the product of earth." In general this is a flat proscription against man's economic self-interest.

There may be excellent reasons, however, to heed the proscription selectively: One is aesthetic. Many people find a spiritual refreshment in wilderness and wild creatures which they do not need to explain or justify any more than artists need to apologize for liking painting. Many other people insufficiently stirred to actually hike in the wild like to look at it from afar or at least imagine it. Few of us would not feel poorer to know that we lived in a world that had nothing wild in it.

A second more universal reason is scientific. As Darwin among others observed: Life is process and ultimately one; we have strange ancestors and a lot of living cousins. To wipe out the wild and thus push to extremes the process of simplifying the living environment reduces the pool of actually and potentially useful living things (penicillin mold is creature as well as the malaria *plasmodium*) and cuts down the number of living systems the comparative study of which throws light on ourselves.

A third reason is prudence. Wherever to date we have engineered major changes in the face of the earth, unforeseen and generally unwished consequences have followed. That record suggests caution in making over any more of the world for man's special convenience than is necessary.

The anguish with which some conservationists contemplate the imminent disappearance of the whooping crane can be overdone. Yet essentially and properly they deplore the impoverishment of nature which is typically the result of man's engineering skills. And the tears are not shed only for the crane. The more we bulldoze variety, the more we make places look, feel, and function alike, the more we reiterate the Pittsburghs, the Scarsdales, and the Jones Beaches, the fewer the species of wild creatures that will survive and the fewer the varieties of men.

The Foundation has been especially responsive to the scientific need for natural areas to study and has helped a few institutions acquire some. A grant of \$375,000 allowed the Smithsonian Institution to buy 329 acres on the Chesapeake Bay for a biological field station to be used by it and the Johns Hopkins and Maryland universities. The Foundation also assisted the Museum of Comparative Zoology at Harvard to set up a biological field station in nearby Concord with a grant of \$250,000. A \$500,000 matching grant to the University of California is helping the university proceed more rapidly with a statewide system of natural areas for both research and teaching. In addition a grant of \$550,000 provided four-year administrative

support for the Nature Conservancy, an organization wholly devoted for the past twenty years to the acquisition and preservation of natural areas of scientific importance.

On two occasions the Foundation made grants simply for land preservation without direct tie to scientific use: To the Save-the-Redwoods League it gave \$1.5 million in matching funds to help round out the system of California state redwood parks; \$232,000 in matching funds were granted to the National Audubon Society to enlarge the Corkscrew sanctuary in Florida and so safeguard it against encroaching subdivisions.

Knowledge and skills for resource managers

Provided human populations can stabilize at sustainable numbers, then the key to balancing the system of which man is a part is to find ways to reconcile his tactics with nature's. Man must be able to manage a productive imbalance in those parts of the system which yield him a living; nature must be assured elsewhere a stability sufficient to minimize catastrophic fluctuations in the populations of other species. To begin to work out the necessary compromises we need to know a lot more than we now do both about how natural systems work and about what viable alternatives are open to man in his exploitation of natural resources.

Take one simple example: Farmers using pesticides normally aim at total extermination of the target pest and locally they sometimes succeed. It is by no means certain, however, that even from a narrow economic point of view this is the wisest policy. It might for instance pay to accept a percentage of crop loss for the sake of reducing applications of a lethal chemical or using alternative controls that would spare birds, fish, and soil organisms. That choice might be rational if (1) the direct damage to other creatures involved economic loss, destruction of trout, for instance, in a fishing stream; or (2) the productivity of the farm were reduced by selective killing of certain organisms essential to the metabolic cycle as, for instance, in the soil; or (3) natural reactions to the disturbance developed pesticide-resistant individuals or recolonized the empty environmental niche with another, harder species of pest. To know what tactic in fact is preferable one needs to know what reactions to expect from the natural system and also the social costs and benefits of the farmer's alternatives.

For the required information and insight one has to look chiefly to ecology and resource economics, to the first for primary knowledge of the tactics of nature, to the second for primary analysis of the tactics of man. Resources for the Future first funded by the Ford Foundation in 1953 and wholly supported since by a series of five-year grants has lately devoted an increasing proportion of its research toward the design of resource management models. The staff under the lead of Allen Kneese took stream pollution as a convenient problem and set themselves the task of analyzing the social costs and benefits of managing the stream to achieve selected standards of water purity. The analysis is obviously immensely complicated since nearly every factor affecting stream quality may at a cost be varied. The nuisance of wastes may be abated by diluting them with increased flow of water, or bacteria may be helped to degrade faster by mechanical aeration giving them more oxygen for the job, or their work may be hindered by raising the temperature of the water with heated effluent from power plants, or without changing the total volume of effluent bacteria may be assisted by better spacing of sewage outfalls not to create exorbitant demands for oxygen in any one reach of the river. Controls on the inputs of wastes are still more variable: One may calculate for a single factory the alternative social costs of requiring treatment of sewage

to various standards of purity or of relocating the factory or changing its production methods to deliver a different kind of waste, burnable or burlable perhaps, or reusable.

Through such analysis it is theoretically possible to develop a series of differential equations expressing management alternatives for an entire river basin and then, provided data are available, to compute the costs and benefits for any combination of choices. R.F.F. researchers and others, many of whom have had R.F.F. grants-in-aid, have already gone a long way toward developing such models for decision. In 1964 the Foundation made R.F.F. a supplementary four-year grant of \$1.1 million to push this line of investigation into other environmental problems that appeared to be susceptible of similar analysis: air pollution, pesticides, and urban sprawl. All of these questions are being researched by R.F.F. in a new integrated program concerned with the quality of the environment.

On the biological side a younger generation of ecologists is making some progress in analyzing and modeling natural systems. Progress is relatively slower (1) because of the inherent complexities (the data relevant to the interaction of just two populations—prey and predator for instance—are bafflingly numerous, and even a very simple real system—the arctic tundra for instance—comprises scores of interacting species); (2) because too few first-rate minds have been studying the problem (natural history and its derivatives have a bad name in science as forms of stamp collecting, and modern biology showing spectacular results has tended to monopolize the best students); (3) because training, which properly requires a large component of mathematics, has been inadequate.

There are two overriding requirements to do better in the future: One is for more ecologists of all kinds from those working on the most basic problems of nature's strategy (the direction of evolution and rules of adaption, competition, predation, and so on) to those with something to say directly to the managers of a forest, a farm, or a fishery. The second is for a focus on human problems. Too much ecology in the past has examined nature with man left out. Such ecologists for the most part have either found nothing relevant to say to farmers, developers, environmental engineers, or have simply resisted men's works in much the same spirit as some sentimental conservatives resist all change.

To encourage the basic science and spotlight its importance grants totaling \$1,408,000 were made to Princeton and Chicago in support of expanded graduate programs in ecology and population biology (the biology of populations, not family planning). These were intended to establish centers of excellence gathering supporting professional talent and top quality graduate students around two of the most outstanding young men in the field, Richard Lewontin, population geneticist at Chicago, and Robert MacArthur, ecologist at Princeton. One of the terms of these grants was that so far as possible both universities would encourage interaction with more applied field biologists, by bringing in visiting lecturers and standing ready to send students to other institutions for exposure to practical problems.

Other grants in this area aim at encouraging ecological training for those more directly concerned with problems of managing resources: \$909,655 to the Yale School of Forestry, and \$587,695 to the University of Washington School of Fisheries, both emphasizing the importance of mathematical training; \$470,000 to Stanford University for a new graduate program in the biology of human populations; \$858,000 to Johns Hopkins University for a new graduate program in geography and environmental management; \$420,000 to the Missouri Botani-

cal Garden for an expanded graduate program in biophysical ecology; and \$483,200 to the University of British Columbia for a new interdisciplinary program of graduate education in resource science. Two grants have been made to bring ecological principles and techniques directly to bear on real resource problems: \$174,000 to the University of California at Davis for a case study of the social costs of increasing population growth in California; and \$62,000 to Colorado State University for a case study of the potential ecological impact of weather modifications.

Space for people

In some important respects the most ill-managed of all our natural resources has been living space. Until recently development of land has been left almost entirely to individual choice as though community had no physical reality deserving communal concern. The democratic principle that one man's liberty ends where another's begins has never been applied to constraints on the use of land except when gross nuisances have been redressed at law, and even that remedy has been left ill-defined. Zoning until a few years ago has been the only systematic device to control land use with any general acceptance. Lately government has made some cautious moves to forbid visual pollution along some roads. Some states and localities have experimented with negative easements or use restrictions on privately owned land for which the owner generally is paid. A few developers have been encouraged to cluster houses and deed open space within the subdivision to the property holders collectively.

America's failure to discipline the private exploitation of land to social needs results partly from the normal conservatism of institutions, partly from the shortage of planners and leaders who understand what is at stake and what alternatives are feasible, and partly from a paucity of instruments to control land use in harmony with our traditions, or prejudices, if you will. Recently the School of Fine Arts of the University of Pennsylvania, under the leadership of Ian McHarg revamped its graduate courses for professional planners to try to correct a common engineering notion that the physical environment is a perfectly malleable, passive material. McHarg believes that the needs of the living environment ought not only to be recognized as constraints on planning but as guides to laying out the works of man for his greater satisfaction and smaller cost. Subdivisions, for instance, that respect the natural machinery for cycling water and keeping it pure are likely, he thinks, both to avoid pollution and provide environments in other respects more fit for human dwelling. The Foundation made a grant of \$200,000 to Pennsylvania to develop and extend McHarg's efforts to bring up a new breed of planner.

The principle of respecting nature which McHarg calls the "ecological imperative" has been applied by some of his colleagues at Pennsylvania to a design for controlling the development of a small watershed in Chester County near Philadelphia. Those designing the project have had two main objectives: To restrict land use in the basin (21,000 acres in extent) so that the flow and purity of the stream are maintained; and to effect those controls by relatively untried legal tools, each of which would forbid uses of private land deemed damaging to the public interest, but, unlike zoning, would compensate the owner for the estimated loss in value resulting from the restrictions. With a grant of \$240,000 in 1966 the Foundation has helped support the planning and continuing efforts to get the plan accepted.

Local governments often encourage maximum development on the assumption that larger populations, and larger industry payrolls, necessarily prosper the community

whereas undeveloped and untaxed lands in parks or open space necessarily represents net economic loss. Such reckonings generally take no account of the rising cost of social services in a crowded community or of the real value of attractive living conditions for which people are willing to pay in higher prices for land. A grant of \$59,000 to People for Open Space has financed a study of the economics of open space in metropolitan San Francisco with a view to assisting local governments in making more realistic estimates of the real costs of "unused" land.

New legal instruments of land use control attempt to remedy two of the three notable weaknesses of zoning: Its tendency to homogenize neighborhoods rather than preserve their amenity (not always the same thing); and its susceptibility to dent under private pressure often without any chance for the public interest at issue to be defined or heard. The third weakness of zoning, its localism, can be got at only through new political arrangements. The Foundation with consultants has been studying the possibilities of creating recreation and amenity districts that would check in certain regions the trend toward the continuous city and provide national park opportunities for people in megapolopolis without assembling huge blocks of publicly owned land.

Conservation and the citizen

Citizen education and organization—the twin fundamentals of the conservation movement—are unfortunately at least as difficult to advance as they are important.

Two sallies have been made by the Foundation in response to this need for greater citizen enlightenment. One is a grant to the University of Michigan to enable conservation educator William Stapp to devise and test a correspondence course in water pollution. Stapp wants to find out whether it is possible by direct education to change adult attitudes toward issues of immediate local interest, and, if so, whether changed attitudes will result in effective action. The other is a grant to the Conservation Foundation to help them work with the state and local educators on programs eligible for Federal support under Title I of the Education Act. The Conservation Foundation would place its own staff expertise at the disposal of local groups who want to take the Title I opportunity to offer education in environmental issues but don't know how.

The Conservation Foundation is in many other ways engaged in public education and often simultaneously in efforts to organize citizens for sustained action in defense, for instance, of a clean river or a regional plan. We provided this year \$450,000 to support some of these activities for three years, in addition to the special project grant noted above. Established in 1948 and wholly dependent on other foundations and individuals for support, the Conservation Foundation has occupied a lonely eminence as the only national organization dedicated to the whole range of conservation concerns. That loneliness underlines the dual fractionation of the conservation movement in local societies and in special interest associations. Dozens of towns in Connecticut, for instance, have incorporated nature groups all independent of one another. On the national scene hunters and fishermen are banded together in the National Wildlife Federation, more purist fishermen in the Izaak Walton League, and the purest of all in Trout Unlimited. Even in one state and on one issue involving only principles universally agreed, sister societies often fall out as they did recently over the Redwood National Park in California.

Much of the fragmentation is inevitable and not all of it is bad. A committee to save the green foothills composed of fired-up residents of the green foothills will work a lot harder to preserve their environment than

could a local branch of the national society for the defense of humane living. Furthermore it is a good thing to have special interests, the bird-watchers for instance, specially represented if only because they are sources of both funds and political influence that could probably not otherwise be tapped.

An ingenious and even promising way to have the best of both unified and fractured worlds is being tried out by the Massachusetts Audubon Society, a state organization wholly independent of National Audubon. Massachusetts Audubon, under the energetic leadership of Allen Morgan, is experimenting with a Conservation Services Center, which the Foundation funded for four years in 1966 with a grant of \$375,000. The center is set up to furnish a quarterly magazine, newsletters, membership solicitation letters, pamphlets, and other educational materials on such issues of general concern as the preservation of wetlands, to both private groups and public bodies like the town conservation commissions which exist in 300 Massachusetts towns. A major difficulty in organizing citizens for conservation is that people do not want to join or contribute to a society that has nothing immediately to offer. By providing such groups with an instant capacity for professional service, the center can assist them over the initial recruiting hurdle and put them in a position to attract an influential board and sign up members.

PROJECTIONS

In general most of the grants that have been made address problems of continuing interest to the Foundation. The Foundation's major programmatic interests now are:

(1) Selective support on a reduced scale for training and research in environmental sciences, including ecology, engineering, planning and design, and the relevant social sciences. The Foundation will also investigate the possibilities of effective encouragement of undergraduate education in this field.

(2) Sharpening of legal tools for conservation. The emphasis here will be on efforts to gather and disseminate information on both common law and legislation affecting land use and other conservation issues, to draft model legislation, and do other research or help provide such legal services as may be needed to redress a little the imbalance between the resources available to the citizen to defend the environment and those available to the developer to exploit it.

(3) Continued exploration of the possibilities of effective environmental education at the primary-secondary level. Most of what is now taught in public schools as conservation—and there is a lot of it particularly in the midwestern states—is probably ineffective in itself and certainly ill-adapted to present needs. Most of it is essentially conservation of the 1930s for country kids, focusing on soil erosion, forest management and wildlife; it is on the whole didactic and moralistic. If primary and secondary education can contribute to a more reasonable attitude on the part of the American people toward the environment (and that is not to be taken for granted), it obviously has to aim at children in the city where most of them are, and it should probably try to inform as a basis for intelligent action rather than propagandize.

THE MONOLITH

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the current unrest in the Communist slave empire has inspired an editorial com-

ment in the Indianapolis Star which merits the attention of the entire 90th Congress.

The editorial follows:

THE MONOLITH

One of the major myths in the Communist propaganda arsenal, a myth perpetually being foisted upon gullible leftist Americans, is that "Communism is not a monolith."

What is happening in Czechoslovakia right now is a revealing test of that prize Cold War (and Hot War) myth.

Red myth hawkers and their activist dupes point endlessly to each squabble and spat between the members of the Communist power-structure to "prove" their point.

They say Red China and Soviet Russia are at odds. Red Poland and Red Yugoslavia do not always see eye to eye. Red Albania and Red Hungary have differences.

And of course they are right. This is all true. But it does not prove their point. And it does not disprove the significant fact that the Communist power-structure is truly monolithic, that its aggressions are carried out by means of unified planning by the top leaders and that its conspiracies and subversions have a common objective—the eventual destruction of the United States of America and the communization of the planet.

Members of the Politburo and the Red Army general staff no doubt have fights with their wives and arguments with one another, as do members of the Cosa Nostra, the Red Chinese party hierarchy and the members of any mortar squad or artillery battery. These do not diminish their danger to those they choose to destroy or conquer.

The deadly machinery of the Soviet Union is now poised at the vitals of Czechoslovakia.

Its rumbling can be heard all the way to the Kremlin and around the world.

Czechoslovakia is a nation sitting on a doomsday machine. The control wire leads to the Kremlin and somewhere deep within its guarded inner chambers the humorless, cold-eyed, robot-like men who rule the hundreds of millions of serfs of the Red empire from Vladivostok to Murmansk and from the North Sea to the Black Sea and the Mediterranean hold the trigger in their hands.

There is little doubt the Soviet armed might would have rolled into its oppressive action sooner if the Kremlin bosses had not been concerned with trying to preserve their fake "dove" image, the "good guy" masquerade that is such an important factor in their brilliantly successful campaign to divide America on the Vietnam issue.

But now the iron fist outline is visible beneath the velvet glove, the snouts of machineguns and artillery pieces are poking from the heaps of dove feathers and the clank of armor can be heard over the cooling of the artificial doves.

Czechoslovakia is waiting.

The world is watching.

The Czechs made the mistake of reaching out for just a little freedom.

And now the monolithic giant in dove's feathers is trying to figure out a way of stamping out this little glimmer of freedom without seeming un-dove-like.

BAY STATE AUDUBON SOCIETY

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, each year, as developers' bulldozers level more and more trees, and as our rivers, lakes, streams, and air become more and more

polluted, the work of dedicated conservationists becomes increasingly important.

The Massachusetts Audubon Society, the oldest and largest organization of its kind in the country, has been very much in the forefront of the constant struggle to preserve the bountiful natural resources of our State and country from those who would destroy all in the name of progress.

With permission, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a feature story from the May 26 issue of the Worcester, Mass., Sunday Telegram in which staff writer, Jane Miller, very competently explores the growth of this society and examines the ever-broadening scope of its projects. The material follows:

CONSERVATIONISTS WITH A PUNCH, THOSE AUDUBON PEOPLE ARE FIGHTING FOR ALL OUTDOORS

(By Jane Miller)

Today, one of spring's happy sights is a plump and sleek robin giving the heavens a worm.

But the spring of 1896 was different. Boston meat markets were selling robins. In protest, Boston citizens banded together to rally round the robin—and the Massachusetts Audubon Society was hatched.

This was the very first of the Audubon societies. It is now the largest. From a fledgling organization largely concerned with initiating game protection laws, Mass. Audubon has grown until it now has a yearly budget of \$1 million—and horizons that extend far beyond their stereotyped image as "bird watchers."

Their budget covers an education and research program, 10 camps, and 36 sanctuaries—12 with resident personnel and another 11 with major open spaces.

Six sanctuaries are in Worcester County. Cook's Canyon in Barre and Wachusett Meadows in Princeton are staffed, while Laurel Woods in Holden, Burcoat Pond in Spencer, and Rutland Brook in Petersham, are open spaces. This summer, Lincoln Woods in Leominster will open a day camp.

However, almost all of the staff of 143 full-time employees, and an additional 100 part-time workers arrived at their present focus on wildlife conservation, and concern with water and air pollution, through an initial interest in bird watching.

The statistics are impressive, considering that what we've got going for us here in Massachusetts is an enterprise on a state level that is half the size in budget and staff of the program carried on by the National Audubon Society.

Mass. Audubon is an independent organization, however, although it was in on setting up the national society and cooperates with it, as it does with other state Audubon societies.

The Bay State Society shares its handsome magazine by generalizing articles to fit all the New England states, then affixing an individual state's cover.

Allen H. Morgan is the organization's young, hustling executive vice president—in effect, the chief operating executive. He's a real go-getter, who keeps an eagle-eye on all activities from headquarters in Lincoln.

Members of Worcester's Forbush Bird Club delightedly recall the time he drove himself here to speak at their annual meeting—with his leg in a cast, the result of a skiing accident.

In the 10 years he's been with the society, membership has jumped from 5,800 to 14,000.

Hearing him talk, it's hard not to absorb his enthusiasm.

"Given a choice," he said, "any intelligent person would rather have good-looking surroundings, a healthy place for kids to play, unpolluted air and water.

"There just aren't many more places to go

for clean water. Boston's system already is as far out as Quabbin Reservoir. Soon we may meet Chicago in their search for water," Morgan said wryly.

"We're in big trouble right now. For one thing, we're releasing carbon dioxide into the air faster than green plants can absorb it.

"We're crowding people and industry too close. The result is biologically explainable. Laboratory animals show marked stress and irritability from crowding and the resulting air pollution."

Pollution has already killed off birds—a reliable barometer. "Remember how coal miners took canaries with them into the mines?" Morgan asked. "When the canary keeled over—boy, it was time to get out."

And it was not long ago, Thanksgiving of 1966, that a stagnant air mass that hung over Boston was directly charged with causing several hundred human deaths.

"Mass. Audubon's aim," Morgan said, "is to enlighten the public, so they'll realize that open space is not a luxury, but a necessity."

And he believes what he says.

In 1953, while he was still an insurance salesman, Morgan got six friends to join him in setting up a nonprofit organization called Sudbury Valley Trustees.

"The public supported us to an incredible degree," he recalled. "We raised \$100,000 from 1,000 members." And then they bought open lands, with ponds and swamps, necessary to assure a water supply and flood control.

"This was one of the first land conservation trusts," he said. "I know of only one other that preceded it, and that was for historic houses."

Morgan is deeply concerned over indiscriminate land use.

Houses have been built over gravel in swamps. "Some are in an area I've seen flood to what would now be the second-story ceiling of the houses.

"A swamp is a sponge, a place for water to collect," he continued. "If it's filled with gravel, the water runs downstream, instead of being held in the swamp by vegetation. And then other houses get wet, too.

"Builders have been known to construct houses in a river's flood plain—an area which floods at intervals. Then they want the government to bail them out with multimillion-dollar dikes. It's happened right here in Massachusetts.

"Besides often wasting our tax money, dikes mean ruin for the river's wildlife," Morgan said. "Also, dikes speed up the flow of the river, and can compound the problem by increasing flood danger downstream."

Mass. Audubon keeps an eye cocked for situations where its knowledge can be helpful. Four years ago the city of Worcester halted the spraying of elm trees with DDT until it could investigate advice from the society that DDT was harmful to wildlife—and of little help to the trees. Worcester now sprays twice a year, but with another chemical, according to the Parks Department, since the state ruled against DDT last year.

The U.S. Department of the Interior and the Federal Aviation Agency came to Mass. Audubon for research on herring gulls, which were interfering with commercial airlines.

The project involved catching gulls in different areas of the state, and spray-painting their necks—either red, green, orange, blue or black.

When gulls of rainbow hues descended on Boston's Logan International Airport, the Audubon researchers concluded that they were attracted by the increasing amount of garbage, residue from fish cleaning and raw sewage dumped into the ocean. A program of pollution control was the answer.

At the request of the Army Quartermaster Corps, the state society researched the hearing of spiders and owls to see if their sensitive response to vibrations could be valuable for adaptation in military equipment.

And still another research project, for the U.S. Air Force and National Science Founda-

tion, used radar equipment of the nation's defense system to track migrating birds.

Research can be glamorous, but Mass. Audubon considers one of its most rewarding functions is educating our youngsters to appreciate their natural environment.

The society now has 26 full-time teachers in one-third of the state's school systems.

"We've been in an additional one-quarter of the state's elementary schools in the past," Morgan said.

"These latter schools, which previously had nothing in the way of field demonstrations of natural science, set up programs of their own." Ruefully he added, "And they frequently hired our staff away from us!"

"We were the first society to get into conservation education in public schools—in 1939—I believe. Mass. Audubon is still the only private agency doing this."

Worcester leads the state in number of teachers sent by Audubon to add zest to the study of natural science and conservation. Mrs. Charles Thomas, of Ashland, and Mrs. John Holbrook, and Mrs. Zellick Jackson, both of Worcester, work full time rotating among Worcester's 5th-grade classes.

This is a popular program for the youngsters, who happily respond to seeing "for real" what they had previously just read about in books.

The regular teaching staff is enthused too. "And we hope it's for more than their getting a 55-minute coffee break while the Audubon teacher takes over," Morgan added with a grin.

He sees tremendous possibilities for exciting a youngster's interest in learning by exposing him to the out-of-doors. Biology, mathematics, social studies, chemistry—all could be vividly related to what's found at a pond, for instance.

"Just imagine the incredible story a history teacher might weave from a stone wall in the suburbs," he said. "She could explain that as stones were cleared from the fields, agriculture began. The class could puzzle over the weathering of the rocks and their growth in lichen."

Pupils show their interest in other ways. Not only Massachusetts school classes, but others—a half-dozen from as far away as Florida and California—have already sent in contributions after The New York Times picked up the story that Mass. Audubon is about to launch a \$2- to \$3-million campaign to refurbish "Laughing Brook," near Springfield, into a full-fledged sanctuary.

This was the home of the late Thornton Burgess, author of whimsical animal stories for children.

Burgess characters—Peter Rabbit, Reddy Fox, and Jerry Muskrat, for instance—will cavort alongside a series of nature trails, which will even at times lead underground.

"Since most animals can't see red light, visitors will be able to see them acting naturally in their dens," Morgan explained.

"We also hope to research new curriculum techniques, and have a small group of educators at 'Laughing Brook' to conduct intensive workshops for elementary school teachers.

"We're still just getting into the designing stage," he said, "but we're counting on a nationwide reservoir of public affection for Burgess and his stories."

Also in the offing is a local fund drive to step-up the society's program at Drumlin Farm Sanctuary, just across the road from their headquarters in Lincoln. The farm attracted 65,000 visitors last year.

"We've got a regular study program for children at the farm," Morgan said, as he enumerated the 16 courses offered—the "poultry tour," for instance, the "Woodlot Tour," the "Wildlife Tour," and so on.

For 3rd and 4th graders who've never been out of Boston, a visit to Drumlin Farm comes as a real treat.

"Ten to 20 per cent of them have never seen a live chicken," he explained. "They think that eggs come from cardboard cartons."

Visitors get to look at a Chinese jungle fowl, a wild, pheasant-like bird, the granddaddy of all modern chickens. When youngsters consider the mere 12 eggs a year laid by this fowl, they are mighty impressed that man has modified nature to develop the modern chicken, which can lay over 300 eggs a year.

Also at Drumlin are two demonstration plots of land—one with healthy green grass; the other, eroding from overgrazing.

"The general consensus now is that the Sahara was man-made," Morgan said. "It's thought to have been a grassland 3,000 years ago. But now we know that if you break the turf of semiarid soil by plowing, the wind will blow the soil away."

Mass. Audubon has a lot to tell—and it is now approaching the end of its largest grant to spread the word. The Ford Foundation supplied \$375,000—over a four year period—to hire additional writers, artists and other public relations experts to aid smaller societies, town conservation commissions and so on, to get their stories across to the public.

"This was so we could, in effect, dangle a carrot before smaller conservation organizations, to encourage them to get off the seat of their pants," Morgan said.

But there's no sitting still for the society. It's been the gadfly behind much state conservation legislation.

Massachusetts had the first pesticide control board. The Audubon Society's research director served on the governor's pesticide study committee, which resulted in some of the first pesticide legislation in the country.

Massachusetts was also the first state to pass salt-water-marsh legislation, and the outlook seems promising for fresh-water-marsh legislation soon. Both are the result of the society being the first to alert the public and officials to their importance.

However, since the Massachusetts Audubon Society is a tax-free organization, it has strict limits on the time it can spend on legislative matters.

"We raise the public consciousness—and then provide the background music only," Morgan said.

All in all, it would seem, Mass. Audubon has plenty to crow about.

distributed over a wide geographical area, is clear. Swings in the flow of funds, while not disruptive in the aggregate, can produce abrupt pressures on individual banks or regions. Without an effective source of short-term credit, the individual banks must limit their lending in order to maintain sufficient liquidity, and the efficiency of these banks in serving the credit needs of the businessmen, farmers, and other members of their communities is correspondingly reduced.

In recent years, the discount window has not been meeting these needs. Indeed, the current regulations explicitly encourage other forms of borrowing before using the discount window, and banks have been reluctant to use the facilities for even small amounts of borrowing because of the fear that such borrowing would bring interference with the individual bank's management decisions. The alternative means of maintaining liquidity have not been satisfactory because they have restricted the banks' ability to provide credit to their communities.

It is with these factors in mind that the study proposes changes in the discount window policy. The most important change involves the formalization and liberalization of the terms under which funds may be obtained for short-term adjustment purposes. A "basic borrowing privilege" is to be established for each bank, whereby the bank will have access to the discount window on a virtually no-questions-asked basis up to precisely stated limits as to amount and frequency. A bank's borrowing privilege will be based on a fixed percentage of its capital stock and surplus, and a larger percentage will be allowed on the first \$1 million of capital stock and surplus than will be allowed on additional amounts. This means that smaller member banks, which have less access to alternative sources of short-term credit, are assured of ready access to discount window funds—and that the funds will not be depleted by the larger banks. The granting of such a privilege assumes the basic soundness of the institution and the avoidance of net sales in the Federal funds market during the loan period. It will, however, greatly reduce the amount of administrative surveillance involved in the granting of credit and encourage the use of the discount window. Since it is recognized that the basic borrowing privilege may not always completely satisfy a particular bank's need for funds, provision is made for the granting of larger amounts of credit over longer periods. This would be subject to administrative examination similar to that presently imposed.

Also proposed is the establishment of a "seasonal borrowing privilege." This is designed primarily to aid banks in smaller communities which possess a specialized economic base that creates great seasonal strains on the bank's reserves. It would be negotiated on a yearly basis, and when granted would assure the member bank of access to the needed credit in excess of a specified percentage of its average deposits in the preceding year. The granting of this provision would not be a factor in determining a

bank's eligibility for the basic borrowing privilege, and would not preclude a bank from applying for additional credit to meet anticipated needs.

The Reserve banks would continue to serve as a source of emergency credit for member banks, subject to more extensive administrative scrutiny to assure the solvency of the bank and that steps are being taken to find a solution to its problems. Additionally, the report recognizes and affirms the role of the central bank as a lender of last resort. It will provide assistance to nonmember institutions or distressed markets in extreme situations where there is a threat of significant disturbance of the Nation's financial structure.

In order to achieve maximum effectiveness of the proposals, the report contemplates a change in the discount rate policy as well; it will become more flexible, undergoing smaller and more frequent changes to keep it more closely aligned with general money market rates. Thus, the discount rate would not be as heavily relied on as a means of control over borrowing.

The Federal Reserve Board is to be commended for its work on these proposals—for its willingness to reexamine long-standing policies, and for the soundness of the proposals presented. The report recognizes that as our Nation's financial structure expands and matures, the central monetary authorities must come forward with new, more creative policies. We must have policies which take account of the basic soundness of our financial institutions and which seek, through closer cooperation with member institutions, to increase the efficiency of the adjustment mechanisms in our fast-paced economy so that the individual institutions can remain responsive to the needs of the communities they serve.

I am confident that after appropriate consideration the Board of Governors will adopt the proposals in the study. And I am hopeful that other bodies charged with the responsibility of exercising control over our financial institutions, particularly the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, are also evaluating their own policies so that they may maximize their efficiency, remain competitive, and continue to play an effective role in the financial structure.

A CITY MOURNS

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, responsible Americans are appalled at the steady increase of violence and lawlessness in this country over the past year. Some of our finest police officers have been victims of this violence, most of them in the line of duty. Just last weekend in Savannah, Ga., a 7-year veteran of the police force, 29-year-old Detective Frank W. Mobley, was killed with his own revolver, by a

THE REAPPRAISAL OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE DISCOUNT MECHANISM

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System has in the past few days released the results of a 3-year study which proposes substantial redesign and liberalization of Federal Reserve discount window policy. While reaffirming some of the basic principles that have guided Federal Reserve lending policy in the past, it recognizes that changes are in order so that its goals may be attained.

The study stresses that the basic function of the discount window is to serve as a means of cushioning the strains of intramonthly and seasonal reserve adjustments for individual member banks by providing short-term credit. The need for such a mechanism in a banking system such as ours, with its large number of individual institutions

suspect arrested for attempting to sell a stolen automobile.

In similar incidents in other localities in this country, some citizens have stood by and watched police officers abused, assaulted, and, in some cases, murdered, without lifting a hand to help them. But this was not the case in Savannah last Saturday, I am proud to say. In action that I believe exemplifies the attitude toward law enforcement held by the citizens of the First District of Georgia, several eyewitnesses came to the assistance of Officer Mobley. While some used his police radio to call headquarters for help, others, with complete disregard for their own lives, chased the murderer to a nearby house, where he was wounded and captured by Savannah police officers.

The Mobley family has a proud tradition in public service; Officer Mobley's father is police chief in Hinesville, Ga.

Like the majority of the police officers in this country, Officer Mobley was not deterred in his devotion to duty by the encumbrances of long hours and danger for inadequate pay, and the lack of public support faced by some police departments. His widow and three small children can find some comfort in the pride of knowing that Officer Mobley gave his life in the performance of a difficult job. The community has responded by establishing the Frank W. Mobley Memorial Fund, which will form the basis for a pension fund for policemen.

The Savannah Morning News paid tribute to Officer Mobley, with an editorial entitled "A City Mourns":

A CITY MOURNS

Savannah mourns the loss of a public servant, Detective Frank W. Mobley, who was killed in the line of duty last weekend.

As suggested by Mayor Curtis Lewis, "we should pay tribute to all policemen, who have a hazardous and thankless job."

We can start by making the profession of law enforcement less thankless, although it is likely always to be hazardous. It is each citizen's public duty to respect and obey the laws of the nation, state and city—which policemen are pledged by profession to enforce. Thus a policeman's business is every citizen's business, and only through full public cooperation can law enforcement be effective.

Fortunately, Savannahians for the most part have cooperated with local police in the performance of their duties. Even in the incident which cost Mr. Mobley his life, citizens on the scene risked their own safety and lives by pursuing the assailant and notifying other authorities. This is in contrast to incidents in other cities recently in which citizens refused "to get involved" in the business of enforcing the law.

Beyond full cooperation with police, something should be done by all of us—city government and private citizens as well—about making our policemen more financially secure while they are alive and in the public service. Each policeman is in daily risk of his safety and life, and it is time the pay matched the hazard of the job.

A local philanthropist, John W. Middleton, has donated \$1,000 to a memorial fund for Mr. Mobley. Contributions, which will be used to establish a pension fund for policemen, should be sent to the Frank W. Mobley Memorial Fund, in care of the Chief of Police, P. O. Box 1600, Savannah. We urge generous contributions and support of this fund.

The police department also should be challenged by Mr. Mobley's death to continue to move toward what City Manager Ploot Floyd

called "the highest tradition of Savannah police service." There is no room for mediocrity or lack of professionalism in our police departments in this time when activists who would destroy our laws, our system of government and our rights as free men are seeking to first destroy the institution necessary to preserve them—the police department. These activists do not hesitate to use distortion and falsehood to destroy the effectiveness of law enforcement; so there must be nothing less than the best law enforcement for them to observe. Thus local policemen should follow Mr. Mobley's lead in service "of the highest tradition."

That would be the highest tribute that could be paid to Frank W. Mobley.

CAPTIVE NATIONS

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on July 10 President Johnson issued a proclamation setting aside the week of July 14-20 for the 10th observance of Captive Nations Week.

That man's inhumanity to man seems to have manifested itself so largely in our lifetime upon the beleaguered Eastern Europeans, makes it particularly necessary to keep this sad state of affairs ever present in the consciousness of free men everywhere, lest they come to accept the unnatural enslavement of some 100 million Europeans as a normal way of life.

Of course, nothing is normal about conditions in Eastern Europe, and even under the strictest controls, widespread and deep dissatisfaction with years of Communist domination finds a way to make itself felt.

The latest events in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Rumania prove that the desire for freedom lives on among the people, and it is the hope of all of us that these significant changes will soon benefit all the long-suffering peoples living under Communist rule.

This singling out of a particular minority for special persecution seems to be the current practice behind the Iron Curtain, one that is sanctioned and condoned by the Soviet Union, so much so that it serves to inspire its satellites to follow in their inhuman treatment of Jewish citizens.

The spread of anti-Semitism throughout Eastern Europe is most alarming and bears closest surveillance by this Nation and all free peoples everywhere.

As far back as 1962, I officially brought to the attention of the Subcommittee on Europe of the House Foreign Affairs Committee during its Captive Nations hearings the various anti-Semitic activities underway in the Soviet.

I alerted the subcommittee at that time about the atheistic propaganda campaign being waged against the Jews in Russia by Soviet officials in their attempts to engender and promote racial and religious hatred and strife. In fact, an examination of the hearing record shows that I was among the first Members of this House to urge that the com-

mittee investigate and fully explore what was then the latest example of Communist intolerance and assault upon human dignity and rights.

It is truly shocking that the God-given right of freedom can be withheld from so many people by the will of so few. It is particularly appropriate that in this year of 1968, which has been designated as Human Rights Year by the United Nations, that we in the Congress should renew our pledges and support of all efforts to foster the fundamental human rights of freedom, dignity, justice and self-determination for the captive nations of Eastern Europe.

CONVENTIONS AND CANDIDATE

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the congressional steering committee of Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY's campaign for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency, two articles in the upcoming—August—issue of the Progressive strike me as particularly timely. In their lead editorial, "New Politics and Old Pros," the editors decry the fact that "both parties appear doomed to nominate for the Presidency candidates who command the cynical support of professional politicians, and both reject the rival candidates who have demonstrated in primaries or polls that they have won the allegiance of the people." The editors go on to point out the convention strength and popular weakness of each of our last two Vice Presidents.

In another article in the same issue, James A. Wechsler of the New York Post ably states "The Case for EUGENE MCCARTHY." In this brief piece, Mr. Wechsler captures much of the spirit and movement of the McCarthy campaign, clearly demonstrating the urgency of validating this crucial exercise in participant democracy next month in Chicago.

I heartily commend these articles to my colleagues, and present them here for consideration:

[From the Progressive, August 1968]

NEW POLITICS AND OLD PROS

The curtain is about to go up on Act II of what is doubtless one of the great political dramas in all American history. The Republicans assemble soon, August 5, in Miami Beach, and a fortnight later, the Democrats convene in Chicago to discharge their quadrennial responsibility to nominate candidates for President and Vice President and to write their party platforms.

In these days before the first hurrahs are heard, it seems evident that a common denominator runs through the self-defeating strategy of Republicans and Democrats: On the basis of the arithmetic of the "experts," both parties appear doomed to nominate for the Presidency candidates who command the cynical support of professional politicians, and both reject the rival candidates who have demonstrated in primaries or polls that they have won the allegiance of the people.

The death-wish is an ancient ailment of the Republican Party. Except for the period

of 1952-1958, when a weary electorate that wanted nothing so much as to be let alone sent a genial and relatively harmless war hero to the White House, the GOP has not captured the Presidency in forty years.

Once the "Grand Old Party," which largely dominated the national politics of America from the Civil War to the Great Depression, the Republican Party has fallen to miserable estate in our lifetime, in large measure because it has persisted in playing the politics of conservatism that served it so well—and the country so ill—in the Nineteenth Century. A recent Harris Survey revealed that only thirty-one per cent of the electorate regards itself as Republican. A Gallup Poll last month brought more bitter news to the GOP: This more comprehensive survey showed that only "twenty-seven per cent of all adults classify themselves as Republicans, forty-six per cent as Democrats, and twenty-seven per cent as Independents." Even more devastating to the GOP must have been the Gallup disclosure that despite the rising tide of criticism of the Democratic Administration's policies at home and abroad during the past six months, the Republicans have not picked up a single percentage point of approval by the electorate in that period.

Our man from Mars would assume that the GOP, confronted with this melancholy evidence, would rally around a standard-bearer who might command the support of many of the Independents and of the disaffected Democrats—of whom there may be a record number this year. But our man from Mars would be dead wrong. Every poll and survey we have seen makes former Vice President Richard M. Nixon the runaway choice of the Republican politicians who will do the choosing in Miami Beach—this despite the fact that his opponent for the nomination, Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller, has demonstrated that he has vastly more appeal among liberal Democrats and Independents.

Two Harris Surveys released in July confirm this conclusion:

One survey reported that "since he began his all-out campaign, Rockefeller has gained ground among Democrats and Independents, but has lost strength among rank-and-file Republicans. The closer he comes to demonstrating that he might be the one Republican to win in November, the weaker he becomes in his own party."

The second survey disclosed that in the process of capturing GOP convention delegates, Nixon "has been slipping as a Presidential candidate among voters in general. The paradox of Nixon's present standing in the public opinion polls is that he has never been stronger with Republicans and rarely been weaker with the rest of the country."

Clearly, the GOP cannot hope to win without a significant chunk of "the rest of the country." But no matter. Nixon has not won an election in his own name since 1950; Rockefeller has never lost an election, and twice he won the governorship of New York against what seemed like improbable odds. But no matter. The polls in mid-July showed Humphrey ahead of Nixon, but Rockefeller winning over Humphrey. But no matter. The Republican delegate-types just feel more comfortable with Nixon, who is cold, cautious, and conservative. They feel uneasy—when not downright hostile—with Rockefeller, who is warm, boldly innovative, and moderately progressive.

We have little hope that the GOP delegates will heed the advice of a magazine named *The Progressive*. But we cannot refrain from suggesting to them that Rockefeller is not only the winningest horse they have in their stable; he is the only Republican in contention who senses the mood of a deeply troubled America and would have the guts to act on the causes of conflict if he were elected President.

It is true Rockefeller has not been an especially heroic figure these last few years—indeed, since his finest hour that dramatic night at the GOP convention in San Francisco in 1964, when he gave the racists and the right-wing extremists in his party the lashing no other Republican dared or cared to apply. He vacillated endlessly this year about whether he should or should not become a candidate. He hibernated for several years on the great issues of Vietnam, and when his candidacy, announced at long last, compelled him to speak up, he was for a time ambiguous and evasive.

But as his campaign has gathered momentum, if not delegates, Rockefeller has spoken out in forward-looking terms that make Nixon sound like McKinley and look like Coolidge. Thus:

Nixon acclaimed Congress for insisting on a \$6 billion cut in the Federal budget; Rockefeller expressed alarm that the slash might imperil vital programs in the nation's ghettos.

Nixon warned the Johnson Administration against reducing military expenditures, as part of the \$6 billion cut, because he feared such a step would imperil "America's strategic superiority" around the world; Rockefeller cautioned against the "over-extension" of U.S. military power and the "over-commitment of our role as policeman of the whole world."

Nixon dismissed U.S. acceptance of a Vietnam coalition government, which would include the Vietcong and the National Liberation Front, as "simply the first step toward a surrender to the Communists;" Rockefeller, while avoiding direct mention of coalition, asserted that "we should accept in South Vietnam's political life any group that seeks its objectives through the political process" and we should neither accept nor impose "any solution dictated by force."

In late June and early July, Rockefeller peeled off his kid gloves and began to hammer hard at Nixon, who remained tactically silent and strategically invisible—doubtless holed up in his apartment counting and re-counting his delegates. In Chicago, the New York Governor demanded to know: "What does Mr. Nixon now think of the military [escalation] strategy he so confidently proclaimed [for Vietnam] two years ago? I profoundly disagree with him."

In another speech, Rockefeller denounced Nixon's statements that the U.S. Supreme Court has given a "green light" to crime and that poverty has been exaggerated as a cause of crime. And then he hit Nixon where it hurts the hardest by recalling Nixon's 1960 campaign performance in the big cities:

"He carried Illinois until he got to Chicago, and then he lost the state. He carried Pennsylvania until he got to Philadelphia, and then he lost the state. He carried New York until he got to New York City, and then he lost the state."

It is this kind of truth-telling, and all the political philosophy and program implicit in it, that infuriates the Republican professionals, especially those on the town, village, and county level whose party regularity, aided by machine manipulation of caucuses and conventions, makes them kings for a day—the day they cast their considerable and conservative bloc of votes for the Republican nomination for President. Some of them are right-wing crackpots, but most of them are hard-shelled conservatives who know "the other America"—the America of poverty and racism and frustration—only from what they see on television, and what they see they fear and hate.

We have suggested that Rockefeller, far more than Nixon, appeals to Independents and dissident Democrats whose votes the GOP will urgently need in November. But it is worth noting, before we leave the Republicans, that events may enable Nixon to put together a winning coalition of his own—

a negative coalition rooted in fear, frustration, and an overpowering hunger to "get the war over with in Vietnam."

Nixon could win the election if a combination of all or most of these possibilities dominate the mood of America this fall; if the black ghettos boil over in bloodshed again and whip up a new white backlash; if middle-class Americans succumb to the myth that crime in the streets can be checked by so-called "law-and-order" repression and attacks on the U.S. Supreme Court, rather than by striking at the underlying causes; if enough Americans, weary of so much conflict in our country, decide it is time to crack down on student revolt, war resisters, and adult dissenters; if the ten per cent surtax tears a big enough hole in the taxpayers' pockets; and, most important of all, if Nixon can persuade a war-weary country that he can end the war quickly—and, as a Nixon bonus, achieve "victory" as well—if we greatly increase our military devastation of Vietnam.

Now what of the Democratic convention? We have devoted so much space to the Republican goings-on in this essay because we feel we have short-changed them—in handing out advice and guidance these many months—in contrast to our obsessive preoccupation with the problems of the Democrats. In every issue of *The Progressive* since November, indeed before Senator Eugene McCarthy formally announced his candidacy, we have argued the case for his candidacy and we here reaffirm our steadfast and unequivocal commitment to the man and his cause. Elsewhere in this issue, James A. Wechsler powerfully sums up the case for McCarthy, and Gus Tyler puts Vice President Humphrey's best foot forward.

But we do have a few final reflections of our own as the convention nears. First off, we are deeply troubled by the steamroller tactics employed by the forces supporting Vice President Humphrey. Mary McGrory, the perceptive analyst for *The Washington Star*, noted that "Humphrey is claiming victory at the convention, but he is running scared." So scared, in fact, that his lieutenants have been bludgeoning some state conventions into robbing McCarthy of his rightful share of the delegates, and the Administration machine in Washington has handed all the key convention posts to Humphrey supporters. The Humphrey organization has acted as though the New Hampshire, Wisconsin, Oregon, California, and New York primaries simply couldn't have turned out the way they did, and as though all the polls of public opinion, which emphasize McCarthy's strength, are merely annoying and meaningless intrusions by the electorate trying to muscle in on the ritualistic prerogatives of the political pros.

In Connecticut, where Democratic state chairman John M. Bailey, who is also President Johnson's boy as chairman of the Democratic National Committee, the machine performance was so raw—McCarthy was given nine of the forty-four delegates in a state where his strength is great—that Senator Abraham Ribicoff, a friend and supporter of Humphrey, felt obliged to say: "This is a perfect example of how to lose an election without really trying." He was sufficiently disturbed to offer his own place on the convention delegation to the Reverend Joseph Duffey, leader of the McCarthy forces. Later, Ribicoff was overheard on the Senate floor saying to Senator Daniel Inouye, Hawaii, the Humphrey-chosen convention keynoter: "You tell your friend, the Vice President, he is going after it like a Chicago alderman."

In all fairness to the Vice President, whose shortcomings as a contender for the Presidency do not include a reputation for political swindling, it must be noted that his over-zealous aides have resorted to the kind of skulduggery he would not himself countenance, although he has not publicly repu-

diated their blackjack efficiency in delivering the delegates.

In at least one major state, New York, the evidence seems persuasive that it was the Kennedy clan, more than the Humphrey forces, that deprived McCarthy of his fair share of the delegates-at-large. Murray Kempton, the brilliant columnist for the *New York Post*, who is a McCarthy convention delegate, reported that "in New York the job was done on the McCarthy group by the heirs of Senator Kennedy. . . . Frank O'Connor, Humphrey's campaign manager, seems in fact to have gone along with State Chairman John Burns's original plan to give McCarthy as many as twenty-eight of the sixty-five at-large delegates. . . . They were overruled by . . . the three strongest of the Kennedy regulars. The slate ultimately forced on Burns is thus far more Kennedy's than Humphrey's although likely, from the melancholy facts of life, to be Humphrey's in the end." It is noteworthy, too, that Humphrey is not known to have objected to the robbery; nor did he speak up in censure at the time.

As we have often suggested in the past, the fundamental problem that confronts Hubert Humphrey—and he understands it better than we do—is the question of identity and ideology. Is he still Mr. Johnson's servant, trapped into defending the rejected record of the Administration? Or is he a free agent bent on breaking with the past and forging his own program, however much that might involve repudiation or amendment of the Administration's tragic policies in Vietnam and the accompanying distortion of priorities that have led the country to run away from the challenge of social revolution at home?

There is no clear answer. The Vice President has often insisted that he is not chained to the past, that he is free to strike out on his own with new and bolder variations of social programs that once made his name synonymous with indigenous American progressivism. And if we know the man, he genuinely believes he means to do precisely that.

But, to our knowledge, he has yet to repudiate a single policy of the discredited Administration whose number two man he has been for nearly four years. On the contrary, on the major issue of Vietnam, he spoke with laudable if revealing candor when he told syndicated columnist Carl T. Rowan June 18 that, as Rowan paraphrased it, he was "not going to disavow the Johnson Administration policies in Vietnam—this week or ever." Said Humphrey: "I can stand people opposing me because they think I am wrong, even stupid, but I will not have anyone oppose me because they think I am a hypocrite." In Oklahoma City, June 27, he declared that the American people would not want him to "repudiate a government or a policy" of which he had been a part in order to gain votes. "I have tried to be a faithful and loyal Vice President," he said in a full measure of truth, "and that's what I thought you wanted when you elected me." He did not mention the fact that his Chief and he were elected on one platform and proceeded to govern—on the basic issue of Vietnam—on the platform of the Republican ticket the country so overwhelmingly rejected that year.

Does Mr. Humphrey harbor private doubts about his recent role and present predicament? He does not tell us; in fact, he seems to deny that he does. But we know of occasions on which he privately expressed reservations about White House policy in Vietnam and suggested he had sought, unsuccessfully, to win the President's approval for a degree of de-escalation. Having failed, he loyally supported the Boss; actually his exuberance led him to borrow more royalist than the crown.

Reflecting on this pivotal dilemma of his old friend and fellow-Minnesotan, Senator McCarthy made this pertinent comment: "Everyone has private doubts, but there

comes a time when the private doubts of a public man must become his public doubts."

While Humphrey accepts imprisonment in his past, McCarthy has been free to strike out at the myths and assumptions that constitute the sandy foundation on which the Administration has erected its tottering policies. As Tom Wicker of *The New York Times* pointed out, McCarthy "now is challenging not just the war, not just American policy in the world, but the whole basis for that policy." It was in that connection that McCarthy said of Humphrey in San Francisco: "Not only did he defend the war but he defended the assumptions which produced it."

The primaries and the polls, for all their shortcomings as computers of public opinion, leave little doubt that the country is most unhappy with the record of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration and wants a massive reordering of our policies and priorities at home and abroad. Eugene McCarthy, more than any other candidate, understands—and personifies—this restlessness in the land and he holds out the brightest hope of coping creatively with the causes of that restlessness—a restlessness which even now is escalating to the proportions of rebellion and may, if ignored, explode in revolution.

It is our grim and unhappy judgment that if Nixon and Humphrey are nominated, there will be trouble in the country—plenty of trouble, serious trouble.

[From the Progressive, August 1968]

THE CASE FOR EUGENE MCCARTHY

(By James A. Wechsler)¹

What the Democratic convention will resolve in the final week of August is something more than the question of whether Eugene McCarthy or Hubert Humphrey is to be the nominee. It will determine whether the democratic process has any relevance to the processes of the Democratic Party.

As these lines are written, James Reston has just reported in *The New York Times* that Vice President Humphrey's managers have counted heads and are convinced that he is "sure" of the designation; they admit only—as well they might—a nagging concern over his chances for victory in November.

Is it really all over? Will the Democrats finally tell us that they totally missed the meaning of everything that has happened in 1968? The matter cannot be quite so simple; if it were, the Humphrey camp would not have exhibited the tactics of desperation—in New York, Minnesota, Connecticut, Indiana, and other places—in seeking to prevent a true McCarthy representation at Chicago.

But any summation of the case for McCarthy involves a paradox. For in the end it must be addressed not to his millions of supporters but to the 2,624 delegates assembled at the convention, so many of them chosen not by any popular voice but by backroom connection and special interests. Eugene McCarthy has come all this way without the support of a single political boss, big farm lobbyist, major labor statesman, Southern Bourbon, or, indeed, of any entrenched bloc.

He has no investments in the errors of the past and no debts to any power-broker. His obligations are entirely matters of conscience, related to those who compromised his coalition of the "concerned"—and especially to the young rebels who chose to rally under his lonely banner rather than drop out from democratic society. He could campaign for the Presidency, and occupy the office, with

¹ James A. Wechsler is editor of the editorial page of *The New York Post* and one of its featured columnists. Mr. Wechsler was one of the founders of Americans for Democratic Action and was a member of its executive board. Among his books are "Revolt on the Campus," "Labor Baron," "Confessions of a Middle-aged Editor," and "The Age of Suspicion."

a degree of freedom and independence rarely, if ever, won by a serious political figure in modern times. He has no balancing-act to perform. In state after state he has defied the orthodox rules, survived a thousand premature obituaries, humiliated the experts, and transformed the wasteland of American politics into a spirited battleground.

But what, then, can McCarthy offer to those many politicians and their deputies who will assemble at Chicago and for whom he has rendered existence so uncomfortable? Only this: the best prospect of a successful candidacy against the probable rivalry of Richard Nixon and, to those who retain some romantic vision of their own lives, a chance to rise above usual political business and achieve at least a footnote in history as participants in the McCarthy miracle. Perhaps the first consideration will touch those for whom the second appears out of this world.

It seems almost an embarrassment to elaborate other phases of the argument for McCarthy so ably summarized last month in this magazine's lead editorial, "Will the Real Hubert Humphrey Please Sit Down?" Nothing has significantly changed except the extraordinary expression of pro-McCarthy—and anti-Administration—sentiment manifested in New York's primary, and the further evidence of his strength in the national polls.

But the perplexity of this exchange, written without advance viewing of Gus Tyler's remarks, is to try to anticipate the nature of the brief he will offer for the Vice President in this issue of *The Progressive*.

In early winter, before the New Hampshire upheaval, the national board of Americans for Democratic Action endorsed McCarthy. Tyler was among a group of laborites who promptly resigned from ADA, protesting its allegedly quixotic defiance of the political "reality" that Lyndon B. Johnson was the certain Democratic choice. His thesis, like that of other practical men, was that ADA had become embroiled in a hopeless "one-issue" venture, thereby imperiling the historic "liberal-labor coalition," giving aid and comfort to the reactionary Republican enemy, and imitating the disruptive tactics of the German Communists in the months before Hitler's advent.

Soon it became apparent that this analysis was as faulty as it was obsolete. The evidence accumulated that the "one-issue" thrust was spurious; as McCarthy—and Robert Kennedy—repeatedly contended, that issue overshadowed everything else. It poisoned the American air. It wrecked the war against poverty. It alienated a whole generation of undergraduate and graduate students, including some of the most promising and thoughtful leaders on the most ivy-laden American campuses. It demoralized the Peace Corps—for whose existence Hubert Humphrey can justly claim large initiative. It intensified intolerances. It squandered life without apparent purpose or gain. It estranged our allies and imperiled the quest for detente. And it finally led, in the face of the McCarthy challenge, to Mr. Johnson's abdication.

To dismiss it, as Mr. Tyler and other Administration ideologues once tried to do, as an incidental inadvertence must be described as a miscalculation almost as large as the fantasies of the escalation advocates.

The Humphrey record of the past four years is crowded with his frenzied defenses of our Vietnam policy, his acceptance of the basic Ruskian doctrine that Saigon is the Prague of our day, and that a coalition regime in that war-torn land would hurl "the fox into the chicken coop." He is also both wise and sensitive enough to recognize that those who portray him as a Vice President who knew better but kept his public silence through nearly four long years dishonor him more than those who insist that he accept responsibility for his partnership with the President in this American disaster.

There is no authentic escape from the Vice President's dilemma. More than 25,000 young Americans are dead, Vietnam is devastated, and—by testimony of U Thant and others—chances for earlier peace negotiations have been repeatedly fumbled by this Administration. If Mr. Humphrey had been profoundly convinced that we were following the wrong course, he had no excuse for silence—even if speech required the surrender of his high office.

On one point there can be no serious disagreement: In virtually every test of popular judgment, the supporters of Eugene McCarthy and Robert Kennedy overwhelmed the Administration's war policies and cried out for a new direction. In primary tests from New Hampshire to California, the McCarthy-Kennedy opposition to the Johnson-Humphrey war policies piled up some eighty per cent of the Democratic vote.

These adversary words about Humphrey are written in a low-key McCarthy spirit, by one who views Humphrey as a victim of a world and a war he never made. There is a long sentimental association; I was there at the time of the civil rights rebellion of 1948, and I have high regard for Humphrey's intelligence, warmth, and imagination. If life is reduced to a choice between Humphrey and Nixon, I have no doubt that I will support the present Vice President against the former one, out of a vague combination of faith, nostalgia and affection—as well as well-founded hostility to his opponent. But I have few illusions about the venture, and many apprehensions about it. Those of us who remember Humphrey at Philadelphia in 1948 will find it hard to evoke any shock of recognition from the young voters of 1968, or to translate memories into contemporary language.

This is hardly to suggest that he has done nothing useful thereafter. It is to emphasize anew that the Vietnam debacle, no matter when or how it is terminated—even on the day before the Democratic convention begins—has been the central fact of life for most of the Johnson-Humphrey era, and only McCarthy's willingness to stand up and fight has provided a glimpse of sanity and hope.

McCarthy goes to Chicago in 1968 in a setting resembling—but far more dramatic than—the Humphrey-led civil rights upsurge of two decades ago. It has been said often, but it requires urgent repetition: For multitudes of Americans, McCarthy's fate provides a crucial trial of the viability of our political system. The primaries he has won—and his emergence as the man from nowhere into a celebrated world political figure—cannot be brushed off as a repetition of Senator Estes Kefauver's insurgence of 1952. The issues were in no way comparable in magnitude or intensity, and Adlai Stevenson had a magic of his own. Those who denigrate the primaries now, and point out that Humphrey has fared reasonably well in the polls, underestimate the qualitative factor of commitment expressed in the McCarthy insurgence. The murder of Robert Kennedy has given a new emotional dimension to that aspect of the battle.

No one should presume to know what advice Kennedy would give his adherents now if he were able to communicate with them. His personal relations with McCarthy (for reasons rooted in disparity of temperament as well as the political infighting in 1960) were at best remote and on occasion abrasive. Yet one must also recall the record of Kennedy's last night on earth when he spoke of the "common cause" in which Kennedy and McCarthy supporters were allied. It is hard to visualize any level on which his mission would be fulfilled if a machine-run convention were to stamp out the fires of the McCarthy-Kennedy protest and reassert the supremacy of the political elders, and of their aged politics. That, barring some wholly unforeseeable event, is what Humphrey's

nomination will mean to the aroused Americans who staged the lawful insurrection of this turbulent year. Nor would the ceremonies be significantly more blessed, in my judgment, if Humphrey were to solicit successfully the companionship of Senator Edward Kennedy.

In effect, the Democrats would be saying to McCarthy and all those—inside and outside of their party—who had enlisted in his crusade that their efforts were a commendable exercise in citizenship, but that a convention was far too serious a business to be influenced by unconventional political conduct. The consequences of such a rebuff could be long and lasting in this explosive time; few could envy Hubert Humphrey the leadership of the ensuing campaign.

The case for McCarthy? How often must it be remembered that he undertook this lonely voyage not because of any dream of grandeur (indeed his detractors accuse him for inadequate lust for power) but because there was literally no one else of any stature prepared to come forward and risk the fury of the Johnson legions? I know from private conversations how close Senator Robert Kennedy came to making that first step; it is peculiarly sad that some of those who timidly advised against it—including Edward Kennedy and Theodore Sorensen—should so gracefully remain aloof from McCarthy's effort in the aftermath of the assassination.

For some McCarthy will never incite the emotional affection that Kennedy evoked (and there were also those in McCarthy's ranks whose anti-Kennedyism had irrational overtones). But any personality contest was brutally ended by an assassin's bullet; the great issues remain.

Certainly we learned long ago that any dogmatic forecast of Presidential performance is a hazardous proceeding. One need only recall the predictions of national disaster that accompanied Harry Truman's accession. And those of us who backed the Johnson-Humphrey ticket in 1964, primarily because we feared the avowed escalation strategy of Barry Goldwater, must endure a special humility. History could repeat itself, for Mr. Humphrey has himself acknowledged in his celebrated interview in May with *U.S. News & World Report*, that he and Richard Nixon would have little ground for debate over Vietnam if they were the opposing candidates. As he put it: "If Nixon and Humphrey should be the candidates in the general election, I don't think our views of the war would be too far apart."

It is in fact Humphrey's greatest weakness that on the two great national issues on which Nixon can be most effectively fought—the challenge to freedom posed in the era of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy and the Vietnam war—Humphrey's own failures stand cruelly exposed. In the period when Joe McCarthy's power was at its peak, Humphrey, in effect, sought to escape the demagogue's wrath by advocating legislation more repressive than any that had been offered by the right-wing rabble-rouser.

This hardly makes Humphrey and Nixon identical twins. But neither can it be denied that Eugene McCarthy emerges from both periods with memorable distinction, and without need for apology. In two of the loneliest interludes in our political annals, when profiles in courage were few, he spoke out against Joe McCarthy's vigilantism as he has done against the flag-waving futility of Vietnam.

These are moments that loom larger than any detailed legislative "batting averages." I am hardly disposed to write off all of Humphrey's positive works because of these blackouts, or to picture McCarthy as proof that we can find perfectibility in man. I do confess a certain impatience with those (including, alas, some of Robert Kennedy's less scrupulous and more frenetic researchers) who have tried to distort McCarthy's record on such issues as the poll tax, oil depletion

allowances, aid to agricultural workers, rent supplements, and Senate ethics. Analysis of his votes on such questions shows beyond dispute that his record is "flawed" only where irrelevant or diversionary amendments were attached. I am fully prepared to concede that, in my view, he has been far too permissive about the National Rifle Association. It is also a matter of record that, for better or worse, he has sometimes slipped away from the Senate chamber when matters of intolerable boredom were being interminably pursued.

But apart from such lapses and heresies, he remains the man who early dared to question the supersecret operations of the Central Intelligence Agency, long before that was deemed a province of defensible scrutiny. He has, almost from the start of his primary campaign, let it be known that he is un-intimidated by J. Edgar Hoover and regards his services—along with those of Dean Rusk and General Lewis Hershey—as dispensable.

These were long unthinkable thoughts in American politics. McCarthy has shown a rare gift for stating the most audacious propositions as reasonable, plausible, and almost obvious ideas; he displays a gay irreverence for sacred cows.

He has been accused of inadequate responsiveness to the ordeal of the ghettos. But the notion that this reticence proved that he didn't "care" is one of those ghastly demagogues of political partisans. At the risk of white backlash McCarthy took one of the most courageous—and least noticed—positions of his campaign: He called for increased Negro employment and residence in suburbia, which happens to be where much of the new industrial action is. One of the few genuine points of controversy in his California contest with Kennedy was on that point.

I do not want to labor the quarrel now, when Kennedy is beyond reply. But it did seem to me that McCarthy was quietly fighting the spreading sickness of separatism, and doing so with full appreciation of the political risk—both in terms of his own considerable constituency in the suburbs and the sloganeering of black power militants. And what is perhaps most remarkable is that, on this as on so many other subjects, he was able to say what needed to be said in tones that commanded respect if not always assent.

In a notable but little reported speech in Davis, California, on May 28, McCarthy offered a seven-point program designed to achieve an "open America." Among the minimum essentials, he called for honorable work or assured incomes for all Americans, a leading role for slum dwellers in running local institutions, modern mass transit systems so that slum dwellers can reach jobs in outer metropolitan areas, and implementation of the recommendation of the Kerner Commission for six million housing units in five years. Several weeks later, in an address to Negro publishers, McCarthy reaffirmed his commitment to a significant role for blacks in the life of America. The nation, he said, could not solve its urban, poverty, and racial problems "until power and responsibility are democratically shared." Blacks, he said, "have suffered special injustices, developed over a long period of history, in a kind of colonial existence."

McCarthy has time and again warned of the vast and menacing power of the military-industrial complex. In speeches in many states that received scant attention in the press, he pointed out that the armaments complex was undermining our politics, our economy, our universities and other institutions, and diverting our national resources from constructive, compassionate programs at home and abroad. Hubert Humphrey, to my knowledge, has yet to present a comparable challenge to the power and influence of the military-industry alliance.

There has been a tendency among critics of McCarthy to dismiss him as a retarded

liberal. In this connection it is worth noting that ten years ago, during the liberal dol-drum of the Eisenhower era, it was Gene McCarthy who organized "McCarthy's Marauders"—later known as the Democratic Study Group in the House—who revived the flagging spirits of liberals in the national legislature and laid the groundwork for welfare programs enacted in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations.

Moreover, during ten years of service in the House and a nearly equal period in the Senate, the Minnesota Democrat has fought for and voted for the extension of civil rights, less flamboyantly but often more effectively than some of his colleagues.

Certainly much of the McCarthy phenomenon may be ascribed to the timing and boldness of his advent; it was his voice that was heard when a nation was restively groping for some alternative to the prospect of a Johnson-Nixon race in 1968 and a seemingly indefinite prolongation of the Vietnam stalemate. But McCarthy also brought distinctive qualities of style, intellect, and wit to the firing line. At the outset he was widely disparaged for his quiet, sometimes almost muted manner and subtle asides; the professionals dismissed him as some species of moody dreamer, much as many of them tended to ridicule Adlai Stevenson because, like McCarthy, he injected the touch of the poet into the discordant sloganeering of the political stage. (Indeed, the secret was finally bared that the Minnesota Senator actually set down verse himself.)

Yet as spring followed winter and McCarthy refused to disappear, it began to occur to at least some of the old pros and their mouthpieces in the press that this man possessed some uncanny political intuitions; they were even disposed to recall that he had never lost an election. It was increasingly clear that he understood something about the mood of America that others had failed to grasp—about its longings and frustrations and its weariness with stereotyped political rhetoric. He could offer radical critique of a materialist culture and still evoke a congenial image in suburbia. His candidacy crystallized a deep unease in the American spirit, and the discontents were not confined to the ghettos. His subdued, measured words cut across party lines and generational gaps; the reconciliation he preached was not one of sedation but a common striving for something better than the mixed-up, bloodied world we have inhabited too long.

Slowly his campaign liberated the country from the politics of fatalism and "inevitability" and gave new dignity to the national dialogue. Throughout it all he refused to pander, or to retreat from positions that the timid called "dangerous." On the crucial issue of peacemaking, he made it plain time and again that there could be no realistic expectation of peace in Vietnam without the creation of a coalition regime in South Vietnam. What had once been branded sinister subversion is now acknowledged in many places as the only basis for eventual solution; it was McCarthy who dared to say it aloud. But could Hubert Humphrey or Richard Nixon accept a proposition they have both scorned so often?

McCarthy has made his case on many fronts in many trials. He has done so, as suggested at the start, with minimal help from any entrenched interest—or even from political men who privately saluted his courage and initiative. There are no longer any great tests for him to pass; the test confronts the Democratic convention. Its verdict may not only shape the politics of 1968 but the future of the American political system. To reject McCarthy would be to assert that there is no place for honorable rebellion within the American house. It would be not only to invite defeat for a party, but demoralization for the country and disenchantment in the world.

A CRITICAL LOOK AT FOREIGN AID

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, once again Congress must confront the question of foreign aid. In one form or another, this hardy perennial has featured American foreign policy since before World War II ended. It has been analyzed and reanalyzed, organized, and reorganized, proposed, propounded, programed, and projected. It has been advanced as the sovereign remedy for the ills of the world by some. Others have stressed their convictions that such aid is indispensable to the national interest.

I am well aware that every administration has supported foreign aid since the Lend-Lease Act, and subsequent U.S. assistance to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. I am equally aware that what has been administration policy has been party policy, insofar as foreign aid is concerned. But I am also aware that sincere and honest men, men in this country, have not hesitated to differ with an administration of their own party on this issue, and indeed, have recorded their opposition by voting against the foreign aid legislation which these administrations have proposed.

I am sure that the administration, and the Members who favor foreign aid, are convinced that that program is essential, and that it is in the best interests not only of our country, but of the recipient countries as well. I regret that I cannot agree. Foreign aid, as I see it, is not bringing benefits to the U.S. world position, or to the people in the recipient countries, that is close to being commensurate with the tremendous expenditure it entails, or with the tremendous burden it lays on the back of the sorely-tried American taxpayer.

According to AID's own figures, from July 1, 1945, through June 30, 1966, the foreign aid agencies of this country had granted and loaned to foreign countries, for military and economic assistance, over \$122 billion. When repayments and interests were deducted, AID still came up with a figure of over \$108 billion. For fiscal 1967 Congress appropriated almost 3 billion additional dollars. There are those who disagree with AID's accounting system, and would argue that the total is still higher. But no matter how you look at it, Uncle Sam has not exactly been miserly in underwriting recovery and development all around the world.

I wish I could say that we had received value for our money. But sad to say, that does not seem to be the case. I have read that Confucius once said, "Why do you dislike me—I have never done anything to help you?" The great Chinese sage probably never envisioned the kind of world we have today, but his words ring true, nonetheless. American kindness has been repaid with hostility, American generosity has been repaid with spite.

This country has been trying to buy friendship for 20 years. I know the pol-

icymakers deny it, but that is what it amounts to. For 20 years this country has turned the other cheek, while those nations who have benefited from U.S. assistance have either lectured us on the immorality of attaching any strings to that assistance, or have simply acted against U.S. interests in full confidence that the aid would continue to flow.

The bill of particulars is long and melancholy. France, which was saved from communism in considerable part by Marshall plan assistance, pursues a policy that is difficult to describe as anything other than anti-American, not only in Europe, but in every quarter of the globe. India, which proclaimed the virtues of nonalignment, only to turn to the United States in desperation after the Chinese attack in 1962, used American-supplied arms chiefly against Pakistan instead. Pakistan, which this country saw as a bulwark against communism, used American-supplied arms against India. Egypt, which is so desperately poor that it hovers on the verge of bankruptcy, has had to seek U.S. assistance to feed its people, even while devoting pitifully scarce resources to its bloated military machine. Yugoslavia and Poland have received about \$3 billion in U.S. aid between them. This has not made Tito any less a believer in communism, nor brought a more favorable Yugoslav voting pattern in the U.N. It has not loosened Poland's ties to the Warsaw Pact as Gomulka made clear to De Gaulle.

Commonsense would dictate that when a policy is not successful, the Government should abandon it. When a commodity does not sell, the retailer drops it, and if enough retail outlets experience the same reaction, the manufacturer stops production of the item in question. The policy of trying to buy friendship has not succeeded. It is time to retool the assembly line.

But there is an aspect of this question that goes beyond the political alignment of the recipient countries. There is, after all, the human dimension. Aid is for people; the whole idea is to help people. If all U.S. assistance succeeds in doing is supporting the prestige projects of a particular government, or shoring up the position of a dictatorship, or increasing the size of a bureaucracy, then it is not achieving its purpose. I fear that in too many instances our aid may not be getting down to the people who really need it.

My reason for saying this is that very often the materials we send abroad are turned over to the recipient government, and sold by it to its own people. An AID publication, "Principles of Foreign Economic Assistance," puts it this way:

Domestic purchasers in an aid-recipient country pay local currencies for American goods financed under the A.I.D. and Food for Peace Programs. The United States controls in varying degrees the use of these local currency or counterpart funds generated by Supporting Assistance grants, agricultural commodities sold under Public Law 480, and non-project loans.

The counterpart funds described by this writer have been an essential part of the mechanism of foreign aid ever since the program began. The United States

has always sought to exercise a substantial measure of control over these funds, with a view to their use for purposes first of recovery, and now of development.

But the whole concept of counterpart funds illustrates what I believe is one of the crucial weaknesses in our method of administering foreign aid. That is, it is a government-to-government operation. American goods, American food, and even American capital are channeled through the receiving government. This means they can be subjected to time-consuming bureaucratic procedures—ours and the recipient nations. The difficulties inherent in the process are often compounded in the case of developing countries by an inefficient, corrupt, or untrained bureaucracy. When wheat or machinery is sold to the person who finally uses them, he may never understand that they originated in the United States as a gift. The receiving government may allocate assistance to those who favor its policies, and withhold it from the opposition. A local businessman may want to build a factory that is particularly needed in his area, but his factory does not fit in with the national plan, so he gets neither a loan nor machinery. The liberating energies of individual initiative can thus be stifled by doctrinaire adherence to the philosophy of centralized planning. Sometimes American goods disappear into thin air, only to reappear on a black market, or even in some unfriendly country.

I know that the proponents of foreign aid will assert that there are ample safeguards in the legislation to prevent diversion, to prevent black marketing, to insure distribution of American bounty on a nonpolitical basis, and to assure rational development planning. But whatever the legislation says, I would remind my listeners that there is a practical limit beyond which the United States cannot go in insisting that its conditions be observed. If those limits are surpassed, this country is quickly called a colonialist and dictatorial, labels to which too many nations around the world are willing, and sometimes eager, to give credence.

Furthermore, I fail to see where the United States has an obligation to assist those countries which do not take adequate measures to assist themselves. I am referring specifically to the question of taxation. To my mind it is not enough to argue that the generation of local counterpart funds is a good thing, because it makes additional resources available for development. It would be a lot better if some of the receiving States instituted adequate systems of taxation instead. Let them raise the funds for their development from those people within their own countries best able to pay. There is no reason why the U.S. taxpayer should subsidize the foreign landowner, or the foreign industrialist, who manipulates the tax laws of his own country, or simply declines to pay at all, knowing he is too powerful to be punished. I find it disturbing that in many developing countries tax laws are either honored in the breach, inadequate to begin with, or, where ade-

quate, inefficiently administered. I fail to see why the United States must make good the gap in development funds which the "third world" countries could provide if they passed and enforced equitable tax laws.

I understand, and applaud, the motives of those who support foreign aid. But good motives are not enough. Foreign aid has to be considered in terms of the total national interest. By that standard it is failing. Military and economic assistance have often stimulated conflict where the U.S. objective was stability. U.S. aid has too often made the rich richer and the poor poorer, in those very countries where the chasm between rich and poor yawns wide and deep. Military regimes which stifle freedom, and centralized economic planning which stifles initiative, have received U.S. assistance. The program has, in many instances, simply enlarged the problems it was designed to combat.

The American commitment in Vietnam costs roughly \$25 billion a year. This year's Federal deficit may reach as high as \$30 billion. In fact, we now have a surtax on personal and corporate income, in order to meet the tremendous expenditures that the Vietnamese conflict has engendered, and to prevent inflation. Meanwhile our cities are in turmoil, and proposals to cope with urban unrest usually encompass the expenditure of additional billions. Where is it all going to end?

I say that we must reorder our priorities. Faced with unprecedented demands on the Nation's resources, we must engage in a major reallocation. It is more vital to save our cities than to assist in the development of countries all over the globe, many of which barely meet the rudimentary requirements of nationhood. Logic and morality both dictate that the time has come to put first things first, to put our own house in order. Let the American people derive the primary benefit from their sacrifices. Let other countries take up the foreign aid slack, if they feel it is necessary. It is time, in fairness to our own people, to stop carrying the world on our backs.

HEALTH BENEFITS

HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, there has been a growing trend in American industry whereby health benefits are provided at no expense to the worker and are considered part of the expense of employment.

Already many of the most successful firms in America follow this practice, however, we in government have been taking a reverse course.

In recent years rather than working toward providing better health benefits for Federal employees the cost of which should be considered a part of employment there has been a trend whereby the cost of health benefits to Federal em-

ployer has become increasingly greater and the Federal employee rather than sharing a smaller percentage of the total cost of the health benefits as has been the trend in private industry has been faced with the situation whereby he, over the past several years, has been forced to share an ever increasingly larger portion of the cost of health benefits.

Mr. Speaker, it is my personal conviction that the concept of comparability in government employment should carry out not only as to wages but also fringe benefits.

It is for that reason I have introduced today a bill which provides that over a 6-year period the amount of financial burden on the Federal employee will gradually be lessened, so far as health benefits are concerned, and at the expiration of the 6-year period the Federal employee will be on par with the employees of many of the most successful American firms in that the cost of health benefits coverage will be borne 100 percent by the employer.

HEADSTART HELPS KIDS OPEN BIG DOOR

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I recently read an article in the Indianapolis News which described with enthusiasm one of our local Headstart projects. A particular sentence in the article leads me to call to the attention of my colleagues the entire story. That was the sentence stating that the particular Headstart project under discussion is held at the All Saints Episcopal Church.

One of Headstart's greatest strengths is the diversity of its program sponsorship. Headstart programs are operated by churches, private school systems, and private nonprofit agencies such as neighborhood centers and settlement houses. Yet the phrasing of the amendment to transfer Headstart from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education would jeopardize the operational mandate of these private agencies. This would seriously weaken the entire Headstart effort. Mr. Speaker, I want no part in the approval of this proposed transfer. I urge my colleagues to work with me in strengthening the Headstart program as it exists now under the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, with permission I include at this point in the Record, the Indianapolis News article, written by one of the really bright and rising young stars in the world of journalism, Bob Basler:

HEADSTART HELPS KIDS OPEN BIG DOOR (By Bob Basler)

Can a child who doesn't know "London Bridge Is Falling Down" hope to have the same chance in school as one who does?

While kindergarten is usually regarded as the beginning of organized learning, it has recently been realized that, even in this basic, grass-roots institution, some standard knowledge is presupposed.

From this realization, it was a short step to the observation there were youngsters who didn't even know that "Old MacDonald had a Farm," much less what he had on it.

To help bridge the "London Bridge" gap, the Office of Economic Opportunity came up with a plan known as Operation Head Start. Aimed at the 3, 4 and 5-year-olds from the inner city, its purpose is to fill the children in on what would be expected when they opened the big door leading to education.

HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS INVOLVED IN PROGRAM

Specifically, the children learn such things as colors, stories, songs, body parts and shapes. They learn, also, through about 200 high school student volunteers involved with the program, to be cared for by someone who has time especially for them.

Seeing is learning for the children, who, as part of the program, go on field trips to the airport, a farm, the zoo and other places of interest. "When we mentioned zebra in a story, the kids didn't know what we were talking about," said Miss Joan Engert, Broad Ripple senior. "So, we took them to the zoo to show them."

And that's the way the program goes for the children. Much of the credit for the project also goes to the parents. "The parents are very concerned about whether the children act correctly," said Miss Engert. And other volunteers agree the parents go out of their way to get the children to their classes.

CHILDREN SEEM TOTALLY INVOLVED

Snack time at one of Head Start's recent morning sessions at All Saints Episcopal Church had ended, and the group broke into song. "Have you Seen the Muffin Man?" seemed to totally involve the children and the volunteers, bringing back memories of their own preschool days.

Miss Lenni Cartwright, a senior at Broad Ripple, is one of the volunteers.

"I really get attached to these kids. I know that because of their color they haven't had the same opportunities I've had. I guess I'm working so that eventually they'll have the same advantages my friends have," she said.

"We wipe their noses, tie their shoes, and comfort them, and we're getting more out of the program than the kids," added Miss Janni Steel, a Lawrence Central junior.

EUGENE TIMOTHY KINNALLY

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1968

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, what a pleasure it is for me to be able to join in the tribute to Eugene Timothy Kinnally who is marking his 50th anniversary of service in this House. Of course, Gene Kinnally is well known to all of us and how could he help but be after 40 years as administrative assistant to our beloved Speaker, in addition to 10 years of serving the Speaker's predecessor, the late Honorable James Galivan, of Massachusetts' Ninth Congressional District. But we all know and admire Gene Kinnally for much more than just his hard work. He is truly an extraordinary man; never too busy through the hectic days we have here for the kind word, a smile or a calm, informed reassurance for those seeking one. We know too of his warmth and feeling, his sincere friendship and the depths of his belief in his God and his country. Gene is, in summation, Mr. Speaker, quite a man.

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF RICHARD M. NIXON

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, one of Pennsylvania's outstanding public spirited citizens, Attorney Charles W. Wolf, has prepared an excellent statement of reasons for supporting his choice at the Republican National Convention, Richard M. Nixon. Because I feel his reasoning and judgment deserve a wide consideration, I am inserting in the RECORD the statement exactly as read by David Eisenhower, grandson of the 34th President of the United States, at a public meeting in Gettysburg, Pa.:

STATEMENT BY CHARLES W. WOLF, DELEGATE TO THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION FROM THE 19TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT INCLUDING ADAMS, CUMBERLAND, AND YORK COUNTIES

For the following reasons I support Richard M. Nixon for the Presidency:

First, Dick Nixon is a man with hopes and dreams for a better tomorrow for this country. But he is also a man who knows that today's hopes and dreams will remain only hopes and dreams until the critical problems presently confronting this nation are decisively defined, firmly met and effectively solved.

Second, Dick Nixon's service in the House of Representatives and in the United States Senate and his eight years of loyal, able and energetic service as Vice President during the two Eisenhower administrations have given him a unique knowledge, appreciation and awareness of the awesome responsibilities of the Presidency. I agree with John Eisenhower who in New Jersey last month said that probably no Vice President ever took so active a part in an Administration as did Mr. Nixon during the Eisenhower years.

Third, Dick Nixon has since 1960 traveled extensively throughout the United States and all parts of the world. He has seen and heard and has a first hand awareness and understanding of the grave problems facing our Nation today, including our fiscal and monetary problems, our loss of gold, our balance of payment deficits, the shrinking stature of our international leadership.

Fourth, Dick Nixon has demonstrated his vote getting ability during the recent Primaries. It is unfortunate that he was not openly challenged in all of the Primaries by other seekers of the Republican nomination. It is worthy of note that Governor Rockefeller chose not to meet him at the ballot box in the Primary of a single state; and it was only recently that Governor McCall of Oregon felt that Nixon couldn't possibly obtain more than fifty percent of the Republican vote in his State when in fact Dick Nixon wound up with seventy-three percent of the vote.

I regret that Governor Rockefeller has seen fit to make personal attacks on Dick Nixon which will divide our Party and injure our cause in November. I hope that he will stop this and pursue another course, directing his attacks on our opponents.

Fifth, I am convinced that the Nation will give Dick Nixon a clear and substantial majority of votes in 1968, because it will see in him, more than in anyone else, the ability to define, grasp and equitably solve the critical problems that stand between what America is today and what it must be tomorrow if it is going to continue to flourish

and fulfill its destiny as an example of hope and inspiration for the world.

Sixth, in the Pennsylvania Primary this spring the state-wide vote for Dick Nixon was approximately three and one-half times the vote for Rockefeller. The vote in the Nineteenth Congressional District was about four to one for Nixon, and in Adams County—among our own neighbors—the vote was approximately five to one.

Consequently, because of my own convictions and the judgment of my fellow-citizens, I intend to vote for Richard M. Nixon on the first ballot at the Republican National Convention.

I hope all other Pennsylvania delegates will give serious consideration to the thoughts I have expressed.

STATE FIREARMS CONTROL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1968

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today the House is considering H.R. 17735, the State Firearms Control Assistance Act of 1968. All congressional offices have received numerous letters, resolutions, and petitions on this act.

Recently, I had the pleasure to receive a copy of a resolution which was passed by the Republican Party of De Kalb County. This resolution reflects the views of a number of Republicans in De Kalb County.

For the information of my colleagues, I hereby insert this resolution into the Record:

Whereas, under the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution it is stated that the right to keep and bear arms shall not be abridged; and

Whereas, basic police powers properly reside in the States rather than the Federal Congress; and

Whereas, some of those States having the strictest gun laws are among States that have the highest per capita crime and murder statistics; and

Whereas, no conclusive evidence exists to prove that gun registration control laws have appreciably decreased or will appreciably decrease crime and violence; and

Whereas, criminals have confessed that they do not usually purchase guns used in the commission of crime, and that such gun control laws will not hinder their obtaining, manufacturing, or using such weapons; and

Whereas, tyrannical governments throughout the history of this world have utilized gun registration laws, or similar laws, to subjugate peoples: Therefore, be it

Resolved, The Republican Party of De Kalb County, Georgia does hereby urge and petition all members of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives to keep inviolate the rights guaranteed under the Second Amendment; and be it

Resolved, The Republican Party of De Kalb County, Georgia urges the United States Congress to leave to the individual States the right and responsibility to enact legislation not in conflict with the United States Constitution concerning gun control or penalties for using guns in the commission of crimes, all according to the wishes of the electorate in the individual States; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chairman of this Committee be directed to make known the con-

tents of this Resolution to the press, to all members of the Georgia Delegation to Congress, and to Senator James O. Eastland, Chairman, Judiciary Committee, The President of the United States, Senator Everett Dirksen, Senator Mike Mansfield, and Representative Gerald Ford.

FANATIC JOURNALISM

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, had any Member of this House taken to the well during the height of debate and hysteria over the gun legislation and exclaimed: "If you have some trading stamps accumulated, a few books of them will get you a perfectly satisfactory gun. And then, you know, if you really want to make a name for yourself, all you have to do is select some deserving newspaper editor or columnist for martyrdom."

I am satisfied every news editor and journalist in the Nation would have blasted such Member as encouraging violence—and even assassination.

It must be a poor loser who expresses contempt and hatred merely because like a spoiled child it did not get its way.

Yet, such an editorial appeared on the editorial page of the Washington Post of Washington, D.C., for July 23, possibly intent on expressing the dissatisfaction of the editor with defeat of the gun bill but being overly suggestive. Sarcastic, yes, but can any thinking individual not appreciate the inflammatory implications?

Does freedom of the press include the Stokely Carmichael type of irresponsibility to incite murder without liability? No responsible newspaper would approve of such hate literature.

Under unanimous consent I submit the editorial for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

SUCCESS STORY

Disconsolate? Feeling unequal to the demands of life? Irritated with your wife's relatives or the clods at the office? No need to surrender to your sense of inferiority, you know. You too can prove yourself superior to those who have scorned you. A well-placed bullet or two will show them all just who you are and teach them to appreciate you.

Although it is true that Congress in its spoilsport way has recently made it difficult to order a revolver or automatic by mail, it has put no impediment whatever in the way of obtaining a carbine or shotgun. The same mail-order gun peddlers who outfitted the late Lee Harvey Oswald so efficiently continue to do business at the same old stand and will be glad to supply you with the same tested equipment for killing. No questions asked, of course; or at least no serious questions. And, like Mr. Oswald, you can, of course, use an alias if you would prefer not to have your name involved in the transaction.

A carbine is, to be sure, slightly more awkward than a six-shooter. But it is really easy to handle and even more deadly. Any child or simpleton—even the mentally defective—can learn to use it in a matter of minutes. A word of caution is, however, perhaps in order. Congress is working on a bill which would make it difficult to obtain even car-

bines and shotguns by mail order. It might be best, therefore, to place your order promptly. At the same time, there's no need to panic about it. Congress is not going to act precipitately in this matter. There are ample stocks in the mail-order houses; and, indeed, if you have some trading stamps accumulated, a few books of them will get you a perfectly satisfactory gun.

And then, you know, if you really want to make a name for yourself, all you have to do is select some deserving Senator or Congressman for martyrdom.

U.S.S. "PUEBLO" AND CREW SEIZED 6 MONTHS AGO

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1968

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, today makes 6 months that the 82 men of the *Pueblo* crew have been captive in North Korean prisons. On January 23, 1968, in an aggressive, unprovoked act of piracy, the North Korean Government seized the U.S.S. *Pueblo* in international waters. It confiscated the ship and imprisoned her crew.

The Communists are illegally using these men for propaganda purposes. Their parents and loved ones have received no definitive word as to the true health and welfare of these men. North Korea has not even allowed them to be visited by members of the International Red Cross.

Six months of negotiation for their safe return through peaceful, diplomatic means have thus far proven unfruitful. On this anniversary of their seizure, we need to reassure them that we will not be satisfied until they are home again. I want to join with the other Members of this body who have spoken to assure and reassure the families of these men and to tell the world that the *Pueblo* and its men shall not be forgotten.

The *Pueblo* and her crew are still being held by the North Koreans 6 months after our President termed its seizure "an act of war." It is unfortunate that the administration did not take immediate military action when the incident occurred, and, in my opinion, the failure of the administration to show strong and decisive leadership initially resulted in our losing our tactical advantage. If the United States is going to continue to meaningfully fulfill its role of holding the line against Communist aggression in those areas where we have chosen to hold firm, such as Korea in the past, now in South Vietnam, then it is imperative that we back up our foreign policy with the appropriate action.

I am deeply concerned with the delay by our country in securing the release of the *Pueblo* men. The time for diplomacy is over. The time for positive action is long past due. I call upon the administration to show some will and courage to accomplish the release of these men as soon as possible. To do less would be an injustice to our fighting men who are securing the cause of freedom around the world.

MRS. HICKMAN (MARGARET) PRICE, JR., VICE CHAIRMAN, DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I was sorry to learn early yesterday of the death of Mrs. Margaret Price, the vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee. I have known Margaret Price since I was first elected to the post of Democratic national committeewoman for the State of New York in 1956, and I have served with her on the committee since that time. She was a dedicated public servant who served the people of this country and the members of the Democratic Party with loyalty, intelligence, and forcefulness and, therefore, her election in 1960 to the vice chairmanship of the Democratic National Committee came as no surprise to all who knew her.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend to Margaret Price's husband, Hickman, and their son, Marston, my sincere sympathies at this time.

I wish also, Mr. Speaker, to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an article which appeared in the Evening Star last night which recounts the many worthwhile activities of benefit to many of us in which Mrs. Price employed her numerous talents.

MRS. HICKMAN PRICE, JR., DEMOCRATIC AID, DIES

Mrs. Hickman Price Jr., 55, vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee and director of its Office of Women's Activities, died today in Harkness Pavilion in New York City. She had been hospitalized since January.

Her husband is a former assistant secretary of agriculture. They lived at 5025 Lowell St. NW.

The former Margaret Bayne of New York City, Mrs. Price considered Michigan her home state. She began her political career in Ann Arbor Township in 1948 and subsequently served as county chairman, congressional district chairman and was a member of the governor's Political Advisory Committee.

STATE PARTY CHAIRMAN

In 1952 and 1956, Mrs. Price was Michigan state chairman of the Stevenson for President campaign. She was serving her third term as national committeewoman when elected vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee in August 1960, the day after John F. Kennedy was nominated for president of the Democratic National Convention in Los Angeles.

Mrs. Price, a founder of the Democratic Advisory Council, was a council member from 1956 to 1960. She became the first woman chairman of a national convention standing committee when she headed the permanent organization committee of the 1960 convention.

Active in youth affairs, Mrs. Price was chairman of the YWCA World Emergency Fund in the early 1940s, chairman of the Michigan Youth Commission for seven years and a delegate to the White House Conferences on Children and Youth in 1950 and 1960. She also was a delegate to the White House Conferences on Education in 1955 and 1965, and was appointed in 1955 to the execu-

tive board of the National Mid-Century Committee for Children and Youth.

In 1961, Mrs. Price originated Operation Support, a national program designed to promote understanding and backing for the President's legislative proposals. During the last presidential election she directed "4 for 64," a program which provided volunteer campaign workers.

CONFERENCE ORGANIZER

Other programs in which Mrs. Price was active were the "flying Caravan," which sent teams of women government officials and wives of administration officials from coast to coast in 1964 and 1966; "Tell-A-Friend," a 1964 telephone campaign to encourage voter registration and participation, and "Coffee with the First Lady," a 15-minute color television program featuring Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson and Mrs. Hubert H. Humphrey.

Every two years Mrs. Price organized a national Campaign Conference for Democratic Women here. More than 3,500 women attended the three-day session two years ago.

She was a board member of the Brazilian American Cultural Institute and was a member of the Women's National Democratic Club, the National Capital Democratic Club, the American Newspaper Women's Club and League of Women Voters. She was formerly a member of the Michigan Historical Society, Michigan Welfare League and the National Conference of Social Workers.

In 1963, she was special ambassador and personal representative of President Kennedy to the inauguration of President Stroessner in Paraguay, who awarded her the Decoration of the National Order of Merit the next year.

She also received the National Order of the Southern Cross from the government of Brazil for her work in Brazilian-American understanding. She and her husband formerly lived in Brazil, where he was associated with the automobile industry.

She also leaves a son, Marston, a student at the University of Miami, Fla. Another son Hickman III, then a 20-year-old Stanford University student, died in 1963.

RESULTS OF 1968 PUBLIC OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, following the significant and enthusiastic response by residents of the First District to my 1967 public opinion questionnaire, I felt it imperative to maintain this medium of communication again this year in an effort to solicit the views of all my constituents on current domestic and foreign issues of grave concern to everyone.

At no other time, Mr. Speaker, have I witnessed such deep unrest, concern, and interest in the conduct of the myriad affairs of our Nation. The return of almost 14,000 questionnaires, or 10.7 percent, is in itself significant. More than this, however, were the large number of letters accompanying the poll in which individual views were expressed in depth on particular issues. Obviously, it would be a monumental task to answer each letter with a personal reply, and I have, therefore, found it necessary to prepare a statement to those constituents who responded, each of whom, where a return address was provided, will receive the tabulation of the 1968 poll in order that

they are apprised of the opinions of their fellow citizens.

The full context of my statement and tabulation of the responses follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I appreciate your returning my 1968 public opinion questionnaire and the supplemental views of those who have felt it necessary to enlarge upon particular issues.

As you know, I established this medium of communication in 1967, during my first year in the House of Representatives, and by postal patron delivery, have attempted to draw upon the views of every constituent in the First Congressional District which I have the privilege to represent. While I realize that no questionnaire can cover any subject to the degree that would precisely reflect everyone's views, the issues listed are those which I consider to be most pressing based on a large volume of constituent mail over a period of time. The results of the 1967 questionnaire proved to be most enlightening, and again in 1968, your interest in responding to those domestic and foreign issues of grave concern provides an invaluable guide which I feel represents the attitudes of the majority of Americans throughout the country.

To cite the more significant highlights of the 1968 poll, the Vietnam war, the "credibility gap", and civil disorders lead the list. Of almost 14,000 responding, 74.4 percent feel that the United States should not trade with nations aiding North Vietnam; 66.2 percent do not believe they are getting sufficient information from the government on vital foreign and domestic issues to allow them to vote intelligently; and an overwhelming 77.2 percent feel that stricter handling of rioters and demonstrators by the police and the courts must be employed in dealing with civil disorders.

For your interest, the complete tabulation follows:

[Results in percent]

1. Do you approve of the President's order for a limited bombing pause over North Vietnam?

Yes ----- 49.0
No ----- 41.0
Undecided ----- 4.2
No response ----- 5.8

2. Should this bombing pause not produce meaningful peace negotiations, would you favor:

(a) Resuming and intensifying full scale air attacks;
(b) Increasing U.S. troop commitments to insure a military victory;
(c) Gradually decreasing U.S. troop commitments and shifting more responsibility to South Vietnam forces.

(a) ----- 38.5
(b) ----- 8.8
(c) ----- 45.6
No response ----- 7.1

3. Should the United States continue to trade with nations that are aiding North Vietnam?

Yes ----- 13.9
No ----- 74.4
Undecided ----- 6.4
No response ----- 5.3

4. Do you believe the American people are receiving sufficient information from the Government on vital foreign and domestic issues to allow them to vote intelligently?

Yes ----- 21.4
No ----- 66.2
Undecided ----- 6.9
No response ----- 5.5

5. Do you support the Administration's proposed increase in taxes?

Yes ----- 30.3
No ----- 58.9
Undecided ----- 5.5
No response ----- 5.3

6. Do you believe that Federal spending on domestic programs should be reduced?

Yes ----- 51.7
No ----- 37.3
Undecided ----- 5.4
No response ----- 5.6

7. Should industries which install equipment to reduce air and water pollution be granted tax credits by the Federal Government to offset part of the expense involved?

Yes ----- 49.4
No ----- 40.7
Undecided ----- 4.3
No response ----- 5.6

8. Do you favor returning a percentage of the tax money collected by the Federal Government to State and local governments to be used as they see fit?

Yes ----- 54.0
No ----- 32.5
Undecided ----- 7.7
No response ----- 5.8

9. Should the U.S. encourage trade with Communist nations?

Yes ----- 28.1
No ----- 57.9
Undecided ----- 8.4
No response ----- 5.6

10. Do you favor the Poverty program?

Yes ----- 29.9
No ----- 53.9
Undecided ----- 10.1
No response ----- 6.1

11. Should the U.S. spend about \$50 billion for anti-missile defense against possible Soviet attack?

Yes ----- 40.9
No ----- 36.8
Undecided ----- 16.5
No response ----- 5.8

12. In dealing with civil disorder, do you favor:

(a) Stricter handling of rioters and "demonstrators" by police and the courts; or
(b) More programs for improvement of slum areas.

(a) ----- 77.2
(b) ----- 16.4
No response ----- 6.4

Source: Tabulation prepared by Teledyne, Inc., Earth Sciences Division, 314 Montgomery Street, Alexandria, Va. 22313. A private, non-federal organization.

It is gratifying to have had this high a response and indicative of the growing interest in the conduct of the affairs of the Nation. I encourage you to share your views with me on these and other issues, many of which have and will continue to demand responsible legislative action by the Congress in the months and years ahead.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. HUNT,
Member of Congress.

NORTH AMERICAN ROCKWELL OFFERS JOBS TO UNEMPLOYED

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, it has become clear in the past few years that one of the major tasks before both Government and private enterprise is that of

providing jobs for the hard-core unemployed. I rise today to recognize and commend the North American Rockwell Corp. of Los Angeles, Calif., for its efforts in dealing with this challenge.

Beginning July 16, Nartrans, a new subsidiary of North American Rockwell Corp., initiated a program designed to provide employment for people previously considered unemployable. Already there are some 125 such persons employed by Nartrans, and the number is designed to increase to 175 by August, and to 225 during the next 12 months.

Employees at Nartrans will perform machine-shop operations, drafting, typing and key punching, and will produce plastic bags, shipping pallets and crates. They will be employed at North American Rockwell's five southern California divisions. A planned program of advancement is included for these employees, for once they have attained a minimum level of skill they can move to better jobs at these divisions, remain at Nartrans, or go on to other companies. In addition to on-the-job training, employees will be offered remedial training in such things as reading, arithmetic, and office practices.

An important feature of the program is the fact that a police record will not bar an individual from obtaining employment. Indeed, at the present time some 40 percent of the production people at work in Nartrans have arrest records, and another 15 percent speak little or no English. The work force is divided evenly between Negroes and Mexican-Americans.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that other companies will follow the excellent example set by North American Rockwell in dealing with our cities' unemployed. Nartrans is showing that a workable program of employment can be a reality rather than a hope. For this we should be greatly indebted to them.

A POSITIVE PROGRAM OF DECENTRALIZATION

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that I will describe as our reverse migration bill, designed to initiate a positive program of decentralization.

What I want to discuss with you here, is one of the truly great problems of our time—one which has descended on us almost unnoticed—and one which all Americans can help with.

In every major urban area in the United States, a game of musical chairs has been going on for years. Our population is exploding and people are on the move. First, they flee to the big city, and from there many move on to the suburbs. And, while we view with alarm what is taking place in America, this tremendous shuffle of people goes on—from city to city, suburb to suburb, and even from State to State. Each month, 33,000 new

people come into California and each year, more than 500,000 people find their way from rural America into the big cities.

In my judgment, the most significant trend on our domestic scene in that 20-year period since World War II—has been the abandonment of rural America. And, if you have any misgivings in this regard, you merely need to go out into the countryside and take a look for yourself. Along with this migration to the big cities and their environs, have come a host of side effect problems that collectively, account for roughly 80 percent of our most pressing domestic issues as we "round out" the year 1968 and look ahead to 1969.

A very significant factor that emerges from any close examination of our major domestic problems is that most of them stem from the same root cause—overcrowding. Moreover, practically any inventory of our urban potentials today will, inevitably, result in the same basic findings—crowded schools, crowded living space, crowded hospitals, crowded highways, and crowded transportation facilities. The pressures which have developed and continue to mount from this "urban unrest" which we have witnessed, have literally exploded across the face of our major metropolitan centers. And crowding, I would remind you, is not the only problem. Conditions in the cluttered cities are appalling. People are being stacked on top of each other like cordwood. Around San Antonio, Phoenix, and New Orleans, for example, more than half of the migrants who arrived last year are still looking for jobs—or have simply given up trying to find them. And, more than a quarter of the labor force in Harlem is unemployed. The image of the typical central city has become well known—grimy housing, smelly air, polluted water, children with no place to play, a mounting crime rate, a declining morality, garbage, rats—and always, despair. This is not a very pleasant picture, but it is, nevertheless, the face of the central city.

WHAT DOES ALL THIS MEAN?

At the turn of the century, when our population totaled 75 million, the vast majority of our people lived in a rural environment. Today, we are a nation of nearly 200 million and over 70 percent of them live in urban areas. What does all this mean? Quite simply, it means that 70 percent of the people in America live on only 1 percent of the land. This, in my opinion, is shocking and totally out of balance.

And where has this overcrowding been felt the most? Right in the heart of the central city—the very focal point of social unrest in America today. For, it is here that the majority of the untrained, unskilled, and unemployed people from the rural areas wind up. And these are the people who seldom, if ever, make it to the suburbs. Lacking the funds to return to the place they left, these are the same people who find themselves trapped and who are, in the final analysis, paying the price of life in the big city. Drawn there in search of a better life, countless thousands of migrating Americans too often find only disappointment and the

sad realization that they were better off where they came from. Too often, their only recourse is to swell the ranks of the unemployed or the legions on welfare. The thought of once-productive citizens transformed into wards of the State—is indicative of this migratory trend which has brought with it a new word—megapolopolis.

As most of you well know, this mass migration to the cities has had a tremendous impact on technology, on our entire society, and on our whole economy. City leaders and urban planners are beset with employment and housing problems that are rapidly approaching the "nightmare" stage. Educators and law enforcement officials are, literally, throwing up their hands in dismay at the complexities they face. And union leaders and industrialists just do not know where to turn next in meeting the choking demands being placed on them.

On the other side of the fence, we have the rural areas. Here, progress, such as it is, has practically passed rural America by. Once the backbone of our Nation, rural areas are rapidly taking on the appearance of a vast ghost town that is only vaguely reminiscent of a once young America in search of new frontiers. Boarded up store fronts, closed schools and churches, ill-kept frame houses surrounded by weeds, and an obvious absence of young people. This—is the face of rural America today.

Here, industry and private enterprise find opportunities for expansion nearly impossible. Everywhere they turn—land acquisition, tax incentives, available transportation, available labor force—they find the door being slammed in their face.

With this centralization of people, we have also witnessed a corresponding centralization of fiscal resources and Government authority—away from the towns and cities, away from the counties and States—to the very seat of the Federal Government in Washington, D.C. Caught in this vacuum, local and State governments have fought desperately to retain some vestige of autonomy. Over the years, however, it became apparent that, in competing with the Federal Government, the States faced a stacked deck. Government assistance or aid invariably results in some degree of Federal control and, once relinquished, authority and control are seldom, if ever, recovered. These just happen to be the hard political facts of life that sooner or later we are all going to have to face.

WHAT HAS BEEN DONE THUS FAR?

But, what are we doing about this total centralization? From Washington comes the reply—more money, more programs, more control. And from the big cities has come a similar reply—"build 'em bigger, wider, and higher." To meet the threat posed by urban unrest, the Federal Government has responded, in the main, by attempting to inject a series of programs with high sounding titles but highly disappointing results. You have all heard of urban renewal, rat control, the war on ignorance, the war on poverty, and the war on crime. You would think that with a major hot war going in Southeast Asia, the administration

would shy away from that word—but what have been the results?

It does not take any expert to realize that crime in America is steadily rising, unemployment and poverty are both up, urban renewal in places like New York and Baltimore amount to little more than stacking people up in high rise ghettos. And while we have appropriated millions to exterminate rats—six programs in four different Federal agencies—no one has yet thought that to kill rats, you should remove their source of food.

In managing your public affairs, we find more people trying to govern the State of California from Washington than from Sacramento. More of California's problems are being ruled on in Washington than in the courthouses and city halls of Los Angeles or San Francisco. And, regrettably, more of California's young minds with imagination, wind up in Washington than remain here where they are needed most and where they belong.

WHAT IS THE OUTLOOK?

Whether we speak about centralization of our people or of our Government, both are interrelated with almost identical symptoms. The question is—why should the best jobs and the highest wages for those who qualify, be found only in Washington, D.C., or other large metropolitan areas? And, who says it has to remain that way?

Are growth, rejuvenation and more money programs the answer? I do not think so. The mayor of New York City estimates—nobody knows for sure—that \$50 billion will be required to rejuvenate and expand New York. And, herein, lies the irony. Where can New York go and what will growth bring? In my judgment, this all adds up to merely attracting more people. I sincerely believe that we will be committing a very costly error if we continue to view our urban problems, as simply a matter of cleaning out and patching up. If more money and more growth result in attracting more people, then I ask—how long will it be before we will have to rejuvenate and expand again? Surely, there is a better way than to compound the existing problems in our cities.

As I see it, the answer does not lie in Federal expenditures alone, nor does it rest solely with the Federal Government. The key in my view, rests with the States. Cities need outside help to be sure—and they need self-help also. But neither the cities acting alone or in concert with the Federal Government—which is the present arrangement—can provide the help that is really needed.

WHAT IS NEEDED?

The "pipe dreams" of our social planners notwithstanding, I submit that it is time for a positive program to decentralize America—a program of action that will first stop—then reverse the present flow to the big cities on the one hand, while—at the same time—returning the control of government to the people.

But let us make no mistake about it. I have no false allusions about the fact that such a program will require a fantastic effort—not the least of which, is a complete reversal in present thinking

and philosophy. Here the big question is—are we big enough to take that all-important first step?

For years we have talked about tax reforms in this country and about how all the tax "loopholes" must be "plugged." And, while many efforts have been made in this direction, the sad fact is that our tax structure is grossly archaic and completely unrealistic. In this regard, I further believe its time we stop talking about tax reform and start talking about a tax revision—a complete overhaul of our entire tax structure from top to bottom that includes all levels of government—Federal, State and local.

Tax incentives for private enterprise—especially the small businessman—and tax sharing with the States could be the very foundation on which revision is based and on which decentralization is launched. For, if decentralization is ever to become a reality, every effort must be made to bolster both the public and private sectors of our economy with the capital needed to revitalize rural America.

Along with a major tax revision, must come an integrated program of improved transportation within rural America, relocating and expanding industry, developing greater opportunities for home building and recreation, and creating jobs in Washington must, likewise, be returned to the States from whence they came, along with the duties and responsibilities that are inherent in those jobs.

THE ROAD AHEAD

The State must, once again, become the dominant center of political and governmental influence in America. The urban challenge, in my judgment, is truly the Governor's challenge for only the States have the legal authority and resources to act in a manner that will reverse present trends toward continued centralization. Here is the opportunity for the States to take the bull by the horns and provide the leadership necessary to bring the cities out of their "cement wilderness."

As we approach the 1970's, our primary objective must be to make America more livable—not less livable. Surely, in an age when we can experiment with life in space, we can also summon and direct our energy and our expertise to the task of providing a more civilized existence for man here on earth.

A rapidly shrinking, war-torn, weary, and somewhat bewildered world still looks to the United States for leadership. Thus far, and out of necessity, our example has been limited to a display of restrained power to meet an ever-prodding and insatiable Communist threat.

The concept for a positive program of decentralization that I have briefly outlined here today, could well provide a new chapter in the great American experiment which, years ago, captured the imagination of the entire world. Seemingly, everyone talks about solving our domestic problems as an alternative to conflict but, thus far, talk is all that has come of it.

Think, for a moment, of the truly great challenge this concept holds for the youth of America who, today, face so many uncertainties. To literally rebuild the face of America is a call never before

heard by the youth of America and one which may be sounded only once in our lifetime. I think it goes, without saying, that if we can carry out this noble concept of decentralization, the same principles can be applied in central and southern Europe, Latin and South America, and in the densely populated areas of Asia—already feeling the acute pains of an exploding population and overcrowded cities.

What better way to put communism on the defensive, for a change, than to engage them in peaceful economic competition for the general uplift of mankind? What better way to nullify the twisted appeal of communism, than to virtually eliminate the conditions on which it thrives? By changing the face of America—we will be throwing "ice water" in the face of communism. This, I believe, we can do by demonstrating to the entire world, wherein our true strength lies and that strength is derived from building within the framework of the public, private, and independent sectors of our free enterprise system. Like freedom, however, free enterprise is never free. But that system, I would remind you, is still soundly intact.

What I am calling for here today, is a complete realignment of our national priorities and a new and more realistic set of goals that will lead America out of its concrete jungle. We must now reject those policies that, for too long, have appealed only to the weaknesses of man and replace them with ideals and goals that appeal to the strengths of man.

This legislative proposal being introduced today is directed toward carrying out this concept. I hope my colleagues will give it serious thought and consideration. In this way, I believe we can resolve the problems of both urban and rural America and hopefully promote peace and tranquillity in all communities of America.

JESSE FREIDIN: IN MEMORIAM

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, Jesse Freidin, Esq., my constituent and friend, was a well-known lawyer active in labor relations.

His passing leaves a void not only for his family and associates, but also in the area of collective bargaining, both public and private, for he was involved in some of the most complex and important labor problems during and since his service with the National War Labor Board of World War II.

The following obituary from the New York Times of Friday, July 19, gives some measure of the man:

JESSE FREIDEN, 58, LAWYER, IS DEAD—REPRESENTED INDUSTRIES AND CITY IN LABOR DISPUTES

Jesse Freidin, a lawyer active in labor-management relations here for more than 20 years, died of a heart attack Wednesday night

at Lenox Hill Hospital. He was 58 years old and lived at 179 East 70th Street.

Mr. Freidin, who represented various industries in major labor disputes, was senior partner in the firm of Poletti Freidin Prashker Feldman & Gartner at 777 Third Avenue.

Last August he was named by Mayor Lindsay as one of the city's two representatives in the Office of Collective Bargaining, which attempts to resolve contract and other disputes between the city and its employees.

ARTICULATE SPOKESMAN

Mr. Freidin, a trim, gray-haired man, impressed colleagues with his articulate presentation of complex issues.

Herbert L. Haber, New York's director of labor relations, said yesterday that the "city has lost an able and effective representative" who had provided "perceptive counsel."

The chairman of the Office of Collective Bargaining, Arvid Anderson, said that Mr. Freidin had been "a source of strength, encouragement and inspiration."

As a management representative, Mr. Freidin, dealt with the organizational strikes of workers at New York private hospitals in 1959-1960; a dispute involving the pilots and engineers on major United States airlines in 1961-62; and the threatened musicians strike against the Metropolitan Opera on the eve of its 1966 opening.

He was also involved in developing collective bargaining procedures for city teachers in 1961.

ADVISED WAR LABOR BOARD

Mr. Freidin was born here on July 27, 1909, and was graduated from Rutgers University and the Harvard Law School. He served as law secretary to State Supreme Court Justice, Charles Poletti and when Mr. Poletti became Lieutenant Governor, Mr. Freidin was named his counsel. The two became law partners in 1946.

Mr. Freidin's interest in labor-management matters began during World War II, when he served as general counsel and public member of the National War Labor Board.

During the city's strike of sanitationmen last winter, Mr. Freidin was appointed by Governor Rockefeller to a five-man mediation board. He was the only member to vote against the Governor's compromise proposal designed to end the strike. The Governor's proposal was also opposed by Mayor Lindsay.

TAUGHT AT WISCONSIN

Mr. Freidin was a trustee and chairman of the executive committee of the New School for Social Research. He also had been a trustee of the Jewish Guild for the Blind, general counsel to the Industrial Relations Research Association, a member of committees of the American Arbitration Association and a visiting professor of law at the University of Wisconsin.

He is survived by two sons, John, who teaches at Middlebury College in Vermont, and Ralph, who attends the Washington University School of Medicine in St. Louis; a daughter, Mrs. Leslie Lillian Cooper, and two sisters.

A funeral service will be held at 1 p.m. today at the Central Synagogue, Lexington Avenue and 55th Street. Burial will be at Linden Hill (Queens) Cemetery.

MR. MARIO T. NOTO APPOINTED EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE AIRPORT SECURITY COUNCIL

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce to my colleagues in

the House the appointment of Mr. Mario T. Noto, a distinguished public servant and fellow New Yorker, to the post of executive director of the Airport Security Council.

Mr. Noto, a top-ranking Federal investigative officer, is eminently qualified to fill this position. A fine lawyer, he has been associated with the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Justice Department for some 20 years, and has served as Associate Commissioner since February of 1962. Since 1963, he has also served as consultant to the Secretary of State in the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs.

In announcing Mr. Noto's selection as executive director of the Airport Security Council, Joseph L. Schmit, council president, said:

Mr. Noto's vast experience in the investigative, legal and administrative field will enhance the airline industry's effectiveness in crime prevention, as well as aiding in our close cooperation with law enforcement agencies.

The Airport Security Council is a newly formed organization whose efforts will be directed toward the fight against, and the prevention of, crime at New York's major airports. As industry coordinator, Mr. Noto and his staff will standardize security policies for all airlines belonging to the Airport Security Council, and will work closely with all law-enforcement agencies with jurisdiction over New York airports, or air cargo transportation.

I wish to commend the Airport Security Council for its wisdom in selecting such an outstanding individual for this executive post; and to Mr. Noto, sincere best wishes for a long and productive tenure as executive director of the council.

CONGRESSMAN WHALEN SALUTES LOREN M. BERRY ON HIS 80TH BIRTHDAY

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, today, one of Dayton's leading citizens, Loren M. Berry, celebrates his 80th birthday. As a grade and high school classmate of his daughter, Martha—Mrs. John P. Fraim, Jr.—I have had the privilege of knowing Mr. Berry for the past 38 years.

Recently I have had the pleasure of active association with Mr. Berry both in the fields of banking and government.

For the past 12 years we have served together as directors of the Third National Bank & Trust Co., of Dayton. Time and again I have admired this man's calm, shrewd judgement of the matters which have come before this body.

Also, Mr. Berry has been actively engaged in the affairs of the Republican Party. He was an elector from the State of Ohio in 1952 and 1956. A frequent Florida visitor, he was elected an officer of the Florida State Republican Committee. Perhaps Mr. Berry's political contributions were best summarized by Mr. Howard G. Young, chairman of the Montgomery County, Ohio, Republican

Executive Committee, who once stated, "When the Lord created Loren Berry, he threw away the mold."

I join Mr. Berry's many friends in saluting him today on his outstanding contributions and successes as a businessman, financier, and public servant.

I insert herewith an excellent article from the July 21 edition of the Dayton Daily News which summarizes Mr. Berry's career:

EIGHTIETH BIRTHDAY WEDNESDAY—YELLOW PAGES PIONEER IS STILL A BUSY MAN

(By Fred Robbins)

Advertising and salesmanship has been Loren M. Berry's life.

He got his start early as business manager for the monthly high school publication in his home town of Wabash, Ind., where his father was a school principal.

"They knew I was interested in advertising and besides, there was nobody else to do the job of selling the advertising," recalls the chairman of the board of L. M. Berry and Co., telephone directory advertising firm.

The new wealthy industrialist, also a director of banks and other concerns, who recently negotiated the control of Super Foods Services, Inc., will be honored Monday night at the Bicycle club on the occasion of his 80th birthday on Wednesday.

Interviewed in his air-conditioned study at his comfortable Oakwood home, Berry recalls he ran out of cash after a year at Northwestern university.

Married in 1910, he traveled through some 25 towns in the Midwest selling ads for interurban timetables and sells vest pocket timetables that would carry advertising.

Asked how he selected Dayton for what turned out to be his permanent home, Berry said:

"I had the list of about 25 towns in the Midwest and decided Dayton was the best town to get settled. I was impressed with NCR."

The Berrys moved into a boarding house on W. Second St., a block west of Ohio Bell where "my wife and I paid \$12 a week for room and board."

Berry started in business with a rented desk in the old U.B. (now Knott) building, with the Ohio Guide Co., still in the interurban timetable business. He made a verbal contract with the old Dayton Home Telephone Co. to sell advertising for the directory.

He later formed a partnership with George Craven, who also had a desk (his own) in the U.B. building and Craven & Berry was born. "I insisted Craven's name be first. It looked better as he was 20 years older than me."

Their operations expanded to telephone companies in other states until the 1920s when changes brought about mergers.

"A law was passed in 1921 that encouraged phone companies to get together and merge. There was overlapping service, two companies in one town. It was felt to be in the interest of the public," Berry stated.

"After the mergers we made contracts with small independents all over, but we got our first Bell contract in Dayton and surrounding territory in 1931," said the man who pioneered the Yellow Page advertising concept.

Meanwhile, after a series of moves to the Keith building, Ohio Bell Telephone building and Hulman building before the present headquarters were established on Kettering Blvd., Berry bought out his partner Craven and carried on the business with the help of other salesmen.

At first the Bell companies had their own advertising salesmen, but "we convinced them we could sell more advertising and they all came step by step. We told them Berry could do it cheaper."

His business association over the years with the telephone companies convinced him the securities were a good investment.

"One firm owed me money and gave me stock worth about \$1,500. A second also gave me stock, and later I had stock in four or five. Mergers increased the value," Berry recalls.

He also has been interested in radio and built WONE, which was later sold. He is shareholder and director in Mutual Broadcasting Corp. in which a son-in-law, John P. Fraim Jr., is chairman of the operating company.

Among Dayton's wealthiest men, Berry bought into Super Food three years ago. He is also a director of Third National Bank and Trust Co. and of a Fort Myers, Fla. bank and United Utilities, Inc. the second largest independent phone company.

"Donald Fox (son-in-law) said Super Foods has good possibilities. He knows the food business and is known over the country. He showed ways to improve it."

The still active industrialist has not relinquished leadership in his company, which was incorporated four years ago, but has turned the reins of active operation over to his son John W. Berry, president of the nationally known firm.

His home since 1929 is on land formerly owned by Orville Wright, whose last residence is about a block away, and an oak tree said to be 300 years old, where Orville and his sister Katherine, had picnics, still stands outside of Berry's study window.

STATISTICS: OVERWHELMING MAJORITY FAVORS SMOKING WARNINGS

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the sentiment in our Nation continues to grow with regard to the enactment of more stringent legislation concerning cigarette packaging and advertising. For the benefit of my colleagues, I insert in the RECORD at this point an item which appeared in Rodale's Health Bulletin:

STATISTICS: OVERWHELMING MAJORITY FAVORS SMOKING WARNINGS

Almost two-thirds of the American public—including smokers—agree that health warnings should be required on cigarette packages, as at present, and also in advertising. Further, 48 per cent felt a stronger worded label was needed, according to a recently completed survey by the Opinion Research Corporation, Princeton, New Jersey. The survey was sponsored jointly by the American Cancer Society and the Federal Trade Commission. An overwhelming majority (76 per cent) of those surveyed voiced approval of the FTC's "Fairness Doctrine," which requires stations selling commercial time to advertise cigarettes to provide a "reasonable amount" of time to health warnings on cigarette smoking. In addition, 62 per cent of those queried favored printing the amount of tar and nicotine on the package.

However, the public did not feel that health warnings on cigarette packages would result in helping smokers to kick the habit. Forty-six per cent of those asked said the label, "Warning: Cigarette Smoking is Dangerous to Health and May Cause Death From Cancer and Other Diseases," would influence a "few smokers" to quit. Twenty-five per cent felt the label would influence "some" smokers to quit and 20 per cent said the label would have "little or no effect." The Federal Trade

Commission has incorporated the results of the ORC survey into its recent report to Congress on smoking and health.

MINORITY VIEWS ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH, H.R. 17748

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, an increasing amount of attention has been paid recently to the legislation H.R. 17748, the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1968.

This legislation, which has been approved by the Committee on Education and Labor, is the successor to the original bill H.R. 14816. H.R. 17748 is substantially and substantively changed from the original proposal, but there are nonetheless some serious weaknesses which I believe should be corrected before the bill is enacted into law.

For the benefit of my colleagues I will include as a part of my remarks at this point the text of the minority views on this legislation, contained in House Report 1720, in order that they may have the views of a number of the members of the House Committee on Education and Labor on this proposal.

The minority views on H.R. 17748 follow:

MINORITY VIEWS ON H.R. 17748

Although we do not oppose the basic objectives of the committee bill, and find ourselves in substantial agreement with a number of the proposals it contains, we are convinced that the measure reveals several serious weaknesses which should be corrected before the bill is enacted into law. Attempts were made in the committee to remedy these defects but our efforts were rejected by the majority. As a result, we were compelled, despite some of the desirable programs for which the bill provides and of which we approve, to vote against the measure in the form in which the majority in the committee ordered it reported.

We wish to emphasize that the hearings before the subcommittee were not only quite extensive but extremely illuminating as well. Most of the witnesses were genuinely impressive. All in all, the testimony developed a first-class record which fully supports our objections to certain aspects of the committee bill.

Before we begin our discussions of these significant shortcomings, a brief résumé of the genesis and evolution of the measure is helpful in demonstrating why it was incumbent on us to oppose it in the form in which it was reported. The bill (H.R. 14816) as sent to the Congress by the administration and as originally introduced, contained provisions establishing two main programs.

The first was a complete regulatory program covering virtually all of the Nation's places of work engaged in activities affecting interstate commerce, the broadest sweep of the constitutional power of Congress to regulate interstate and foreign commerce.

This program, to be exclusively administered by the Secretary of Labor, included the setting of occupational safety and health standards and their enforcement through a system of inspections, remedial administrative orders, summary administrative stop-work orders, and substantial civil monetary penalties as well as denial or termination of

Government contracts for enterprises found by the Secretary to be in violation.

Moreover, despite these drastic sanctions the original bill was sadly lacking in adequate judicial or even administrative safeguards. Hence, we concluded that this regulatory portion of the proposal was wholly lacking in equity and constituted an imminent threat of undeserved economic hardship, even disaster, for an incalculable number of employers and their employees.

However, the other portion of the bill contained many features which are beneficial, and in large part, quite acceptable. As the Secretary of Labor observed, available information on the nature and frequency of occupational injuries and diseases is inadequate. The original bill sought to meet this problem by authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to undertake research geared to the prevention of such diseases and accidents, and by authorizing funds to improve the reporting procedures regarding their nature and frequency.

Similarly, there can be little doubt that there is an insufficient supply of trained, competent personnel sufficiently conversant with the problems of occupational health and safety to help educate employees and employers in the most effective preventive practices or to inspect places of work with an eye to uncovering safety or health hazards. The original bill recognizes this shortage, and provided for the training of needed personnel, and for the establishment of a program to educate employees and employers in matters affecting on-the-job safety and health.

And finally, the original bill provided for grants to the States to assist them in identifying their needs and responsibilities in the area of occupational safety and health and in developing plans for (1) establishing systems for the collection of pertinent and useful information and data; and (2) for increasing the number and skills of occupational health and safety personnel. We found this part of the original bill substantially acceptable, and it is embodied in the bill as reported by the committee but with the significant addition which we proposed, to wit, providing grants to the States for aiding them in administering and enforcing their approved plans.

As a matter of fact, not only do we not oppose this nonregulatory portion of the committee bill; it is our firm belief that these nonregulatory programs constitute the proper sphere for Federal activity in the field of safety and health, and that the primary, or at the very least, a coequal role, in the regulatory sphere is the proper function of the States, as it has always been heretofore.

Unfortunately, the original bill would have eventually eliminated the regulatory functions of the States with respect to occupational safety and health. We are delighted that the committee bill amended the original to make possible the preservation of these functions by the States.

At this point, it is appropriate for us to point out that the changes made by the committee bill in the first 13 sections of the original bill constitute, in effect, an entirely new and different measure bearing little resemblance to the original in all but a very few respects.

These 13 sections are devoted to the regulatory role of both the Federal Government and of the States. We have no reluctance in adding that most of these changes have significantly improved the measure and that they were brought about, in the main, as a result of amendments and suggestions which we offered in the committee.

Our quarrel with the committee bill revolves around the rejection by the committee's majority of several of our proposals. These, although few in number, are nevertheless essential to make the bill truly equitable as well as genuinely effective, and to help achieve these goals not only by the threat

of sanctions and punishments but by providing incentives and inducements to that end.

The bill, as reported, now contains provisions which enlist the active participation of professional experts and organizations specially qualified in the safety and health field. Due process by means of judicial review is assured at every stage of the regulatory process. The States may, if they so desire, assume important responsibilities in occupational safety and health, even to the extent of taking over the exclusive exercise of the regulatory functions of the Federal Government, and may receive financial aid from the Federal Government if they choose to do so. As we have stated, these indispensable features were not in the original bill—their inclusion in the measure before us is our contribution to the proposed legislation.

However, we are deeply disturbed by the committee's refusal to accept three of our amendments. We are pleased that they constitute only a very small number of the many we offered, the overwhelming majority of which were approved. But these three we regard as indispensable to achieve the objectives for which the bill was allegedly designed.

Summarized briefly, we proposed that the bill be modified in the following respects:

1. The complete replacement of the Secretary and the Department of Labor in the administration and enforcement of the regulatory provisions of the bill by an independent Occupational Safety and Health Board, a majority of whose members would be chosen from individuals who by training and experience were professional experts in the field of occupational safety and health.

2. The provision of a limited exemption from the coverage of the legislation for those enterprises which clearly demonstrate that they are effectively meeting health and safety performance requirements and that their record in this respect is outstanding.

3. The bill, as reported, contains a provision giving the Department of Labor's inspector exclusive and virtually unrestricted authority to order the summary removal of all employees from any place of work in which he finds that a violation of a health or safety standard may reasonably be expected to cause death or serious physical harm immediately or before the imminence of such danger can be eliminated. Such an order, when carried out, will, in most cases, result in substantial financial damage to the employer and to the employees involved. The sole remedy the bill provides for such damage is a right to sue the United States in the Court of Claims but only if the stop-work order was issued arbitrarily, capriciously, or without reasonable cause. We proposed that recovery in such a suit for the damages actually suffered should also be permitted if the order is set aside by the appropriate court as erroneous.

At this point we shall discuss each of these three rejected proposals in some detail for the purpose of demonstrating both their desirability and their necessity.

I. AN INDEPENDENT OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH BOARD

If there is one conclusion that the hearings on the bill have established beyond any reasonable doubt, it is the failure of the Department of Labor effectively to administer and enforce those occupational safety programs over which it now has statutory authority, and in one case, at least, the Walsh-Healey Act, has had such authority for many years.

On this score the testimony, regardless of its source—labor, management, professional safety experts—the witnesses without exception were in agreement. Typical of them all was one witness who cannot be suspected of any hostility toward either the Secretary or the Department of Labor and who in fact supported the bill. Nevertheless, Mr. George Meany, the president of the AFL-CIO, made

the following comment in his appearance before the subcommittee:

"I would be less than fair to the States if I did not point out the shortcomings of the Federal Government to meet its responsibilities to improve the working environment within its area of jurisdiction.

"For many years, the Walsh-Healey and the Longshoremen and Harbor Workers' Compensation Acts have not been adequately enforced. It is only recently that a beginning in that direction has been made under the latter act by the Labor Department.

"Finally, within the Federal executive branch, itself, the Safety 70 program [for which the Labor Department has the primary responsibility] has fallen far short of its goal of reducing lost-time accidents among Federal employees by 30 percent.

"The record unfortunately shows that the Federal Government has also failed to consider worker health and safety as a matter of prime importance and has failed to do something significant about it."

Paradoxically, despite this long record of inadequacy in the occupational health and safety field, the Department of Labor drafted the original administration bill without consulting a single one of the outside non-Federal organizations, institutions, or individuals who have long experience in dealing with the problems of safe and healthful working conditions and who are universally recognized as professionally expert in such matters. Virtually every witness was asked and all of them, with only a single exception, denied having been consulted by the Department. Even that exception, Mr. Meany, did not unequivocally declare that the AFL-CIO has been so consulted. All he would say was, and we quote:

"I can't give you a detailed answer but I am quite sure that we have a very active legislative department. I am quite sure some of our people got a look at this thing. Whether they were consulted in the sense that they had a hand in the drafting, I don't know, but I would not be surprised if that were true."

Strangely enough, only a few years ago, the Labor Department, having decided that the Walsh-Healey Act's requirement of a safe and healthful working place for the employees of Government contractors ought to be implemented after many years of almost total neglect, asked for guidance from industrial safety and health agencies of some of the States. Nothing could be more revealing of the complete lack of expert "know-how" with respect to occupational health and safety which characterizes the Labor Department. This episode also strongly indicates the Department's awareness of its own deficiencies in this respect.

One can only wonder at its failure similarly to consult these State agencies, or anyone else for that matter, in its preparation of the administration bill, as originally introduced. The submission of that legislative monstrosity was an insult, probably not consciously intended, to the intelligence of the Congress, and we are happy that our committee, in the reported bill, has already transformed it almost beyond recognition.

One major theme that was repeated during the hearings by virtually all of the expert witnesses was the extreme shortage of highly qualified professional personnel in the health and safety field. The administration bill indicates cognizance of such a shortage by its inclusion of provisions designed to provide means for increasing the supply.

As a matter of fact, when the Secretary of Labor testified on February 1, he was asked if it would not be desirable to provide training in occupational health and safety skills. He responded by declaring that "my answer to your question would be an unqualified affirmative."

Obviously, in view of the fact that the Department of Labor has at its disposal hundreds of millions of dollars to provide training for the unemployed under the MDTA program, the CEP program, and certain phases of the antipoverty programs, all subject to the authority and control of the Secretary of Labor, it would seem reasonable to expect that among these manifold training activities, a few at any rate, would be in the occupational health and safety field where both the need and the short supply of qualified personnel are so great.

On March 14, a month and half later, the subcommittee conducting the hearings on health and safety was asked by the minority members to inquire formally of the Secretary of Labor if any training activities in occupational health and safety were being conducted in any of the numerous training programs within his jurisdiction. The Secretary's subsequent reply address to the subcommittee chairman which appears in the hearing record without a date reads as follows:

"DEAR ELMER: Jim Harrison called concerning the forthcoming hearings on occupational safety, and asked that we let you know for inclusion in the hearing record, if anything has been done under MDTA to train people in the field of occupational health and safety.

"A thorough check of our manpower programs reveals that nothing specific has been pursued in this area.

"Sincerely,

"WILLARD WIRTZ,
"Secretary of Labor."

It should be noted that MDTA has been on the statute books since 1962, the Economic Opportunity Act since 1964, and that the shortage of and need for qualified personnel in occupational health and safety antedated both statutes, and that the existence of both the need and the shortage has been widely recognized for many years. It is quite obvious that an agency whose right hand seems to be entirely unaware of what its left hand is doing inspires little confidence in its ability to administer effectively the activities carried on by either hand.

A final consideration in reaching the conclusion that the Department of Labor has not even the most elementary qualifications for administering and enforcing an occupational safety and health program, is its total lack of experience or appropriate knowledge in the field of occupational health as distinguished from that of safety. Although both have as their objectives the protection of workers against the bodily harm which may be incurred in their places of work, technically and scientifically they are utterly different and the skills and expertise for dealing effectively with each have virtually nothing in common.

The Public Health Service in the Department of HEW has both the skills and the experience for handling the problems of occupational health hazards. Nevertheless, under the committee bill, its role is wholly subordinate, merely consultative to the Secretary of Labor. As pointed out by the Industrial Medical Association in its testimony:

"The legislation proposes that the Secretary of Labor prescribe the standards after appropriate consultation with other Federal agencies. It is our belief that the role of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in establishing standards in occupational health should be much broader than providing consultation. We recommend that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Labor concur in the prescribed standards."

This subordinate role of HEW which has all the expertise in the occupational health field, to the Department of Labor which knows nothing about occupational health and little enough about occupational safety, constitutes an incomprehensible anomaly.

All the professional experts are agreed that American industry has done extremely well in dealing with the hazards of occupational accidents, and that most of the remaining problems in that area involve human error. But all agree with equal emphasis, that although much progress has been made in dealing with environmental health problems, even more is still unknown, as Secretary of Labor Wirtz conceded, and that these problems have become far more important than physical and mechanical accidents. They conclude, therefore, that the primary and major efforts for achieving the protection of the worker in his place of work should be directed at environmental health. Nevertheless the committee bill hands the entire job to the Department of Labor, which as we have shown, has demonstrated its complete lack of qualifications for performing it.

Hence we concluded that a matter of such tremendous national importance as occupational health and safety should not be entrusted to an already overburdened and obviously unqualified Department of Labor. We proposed in committee, and intend to do the same on the floor, to establish a continuing full-time independent Occupational Safety and Health Board, a majority of whose members would be distinguished by their contributions and experience in the field of occupational health and safety. Together with a permanent staff consisting of professional experts selected from both the health and safety fields in the proper proportions, and the assistance of advisory committees chosen on a similar basis as well as the advice and recommendations from the appropriate agencies at all levels of government, such a Board would be charged with both the promulgation of the necessary standards and regulations and their enforcement.

The fact that the proposed legislation is concerned with workers is not sufficient reason for placing the program under the Department of Labor. The Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, the National Mediation Board, and the National Labor Relations Board, for example, are wholly concerned with matters pertaining to labor—nevertheless, they are entirely independent of the Department of Labor. Thus, there is ample statutory precedent for our proposed independent Safety and Health Board.

But even more significant is this. A majority of the members of the Board will not be appointed because they are Democrats or Republicans, or spokesmen for management or for labor, an approach which, unfortunately, has all too often been followed in the making of appointments to important Federal public positions. The problems to be dealt with are not political, they are not primarily economic, they do not deal with issues where there are deep differences concerning policy. To the contrary, these problems are almost entirely technical, and highly technical at that. The appointment of an independent Board, a majority of whose members must be highly competent professional experts in a field where the subject matter is almost wholly objective and susceptible of genuinely scientific and technical analysis, judgment, and decision, would inspire the utmost confidence in every segment of the American public.

And finally the creation of a Board of this kind would more than meet the recommendations for a national advisory commission or some variation thereof constituted along similar lines, which were made by the leading professional organizations in the health and safety field, such as the National Safety Council, the American Industrial Hygiene Association, the American Academy of Occupational Medicine, the Industrial Medical Association, the American Society of Safety Engineers, and several of the State health or industrial safety agencies which testified in the hearings.

II. EXEMPTIONS BASED ON PERFORMANCE

In most Federal legislation of a regulatory nature which provides for exemptions from the legislation's coverage, the exemptions are usually granted based on the size of the enterprise measured by volume of sales or the number of employees; or, as is too often the case, as a result of the political or economic strength and influence of the various forces or interests which either favor or oppose the particular exemption. Obviously, the results contain a large degree of irrationality or arbitrariness, and leave in their wake numerous disgruntled, dissatisfied, and unhappy elements.

Moreover, and we know of no exceptions to this, Federal regulatory legislation seems always to seek to achieve its objectives through sanctions, punitive in nature, either civil or criminal, and frequently both. The committee bill is no exception. We strongly believe that certainly, in a field like occupational safety and health, without discarding the punitive sanctions in the committee bill, there should be added thereto, inducements to employers to so perfect their health and safety programs as to approximate the ideal goal of total elimination of all hazards in the work environment.

This, we are convinced can be done effectively through the granting of exemptions from the application of the committee bill to enterprises which can show, objectively, that they have succeeded in maintaining the best possible health and safety conditions in their work premises for a period sufficiently extended to demonstrate that their success is permanent and not temporary, intermittent, accidental, or unreliable. This would be entirely consistent with the position of the National Safety Council that the important test for success in the health and safety field should be based on "safety performance."

We arrived at this conclusion on the virtually unchallenged testimony given by many witnesses at the hearings of the extraordinary record of American industry in reducing occupational injuries and illnesses.

Certainly the evidence in the hearings reveals the excellent progress that has been made through the voluntary efforts of employers, employees, and private professional organizations aided by State safety programs and State health and safety officials. According to the National Safety Council, the Nation's leading authority in the field of health, and safety, accidental deaths connected with work dropped from 17,000 in 1947 to 14,200 in 1967; disabilities were reduced from 4,090,000 in 1947 to 2,200,000 in 1967. This impressive decrease in deaths and disabilities occurred during a period when the work force was increasing by over 10 million employees.

Moreover, the reported death and disability totals give a grossly exaggerated picture of occupational hazards in industry. Of the 14,500 "occupational" deaths in 1966, 3,200 (21 percent) occurred in motor vehicle accidents, 2,900 (or 20 percent) occurred among agricultural workers, and 3,200 (or 21 percent) among service or government (including Federal Government) workers.

In this connection it is pertinent to point out that Secretary of Labor Wirtz, in his testimony before our subcommittee, cited the 14,500 figure for "occupational" deaths, but failed to mention that the national injury ratios for Federal employees were higher than those for private industry, and failed to give the breakdown of the 14,500 figure that we have set forth above. It is obvious that automobile accidents, even though considered work-connected if they occur in the performance of the employee's work duties, have no more connection with safe or healthful working conditions than automobile accidents that are wholly unrelated to a job. It is cause for considerable concern to us that unless our proposal for an independent board

is adopted, administration and enforcement of the committee bill will be left to an agency, which in addition to all of its shortcomings, which we have already described, fails either through ignorance or deliberation, to provide the Congress with the necessary relevant information and data.)

Dramatic improvement in industrial safety is also shown by the sharp drop in the occupational accident rate over the years. The fatality rate has dropped from 42 deaths per 100,000 workers in 1936, to 31 in 1946, to 20 in 1966. In 1926 there were 31.9 disabling injuries for every million man-hours of work; by 1946, this was reduced to 14.6; and by 1966, this was cut to 6.9 per million man-hours.

Moreover, it is unchallengeable that the working conditions of the American wage earner are the safest and most healthful in the world—no other country anywhere even comes close. Such industries as steel, chemicals, and petroleum, which years ago were accurately regarded as among the most dangerous in which to work, have achieved a degree of occupational health and safety which is so miraculous as almost to defy belief. And finally, the statistical record makes it plain that the American worker is far safer at his job than he is at home or on the highway.

In face of this magnificent record, if only to provide a reward for a task well done and constantly improving, American enterprise should be offered the incentive of an exemption from Federal regulation (it would continue subject to the State laws) if it continues its upward progress. In any event, there is another important factor worthy of serious consideration—it would lessen the impossible task of the administering and enforcing Federal agency (whether the Labor Department or an independent board) of policing all of American enterprise.

It has been estimated that the inspection force alone which would be needed to handle the job would cost the Federal taxpayer at the very least \$175 million. Confronted with a much smaller task, the National Labor Relations Board on its own administrative initiative has refused to assert its jurisdiction in certain classes of cases which, in its opinion, are of lesser importance in achieving the statutory policy. Without a statutory exemption in the committee bill, we will inevitably wind up with an administrative exemption based on the judgment of the executive branch rather than on the decision of the Congress based on the objective standard of demonstrated superior performance.

III. THE PROPER BASIS FOR DAMAGE SUITS

As we have indicated, the committee bill provides for a summary proceeding for, in effect, shutting down an employer's operations in whole or in part. The only relief provided for an employer in the subcommittee bill was a suit in the Court of Claims for damages against the United States if the shutdown order was issued arbitrarily or capriciously.

We pointed out that such a remedy was entirely inadequate. In the first place, given the extremely broad discretion granted to the Secretary of Labor, the normal difficulty of proving arbitrariness or capriciousness would be compounded geometrically. Moreover, we pointed out, why should an employer whose operations have been summarily closed down with substantial losses to him, remain uncompensated if it ultimately develops, in the final judgment of the court, that the action of the Secretary (or the board), although not arbitrary or capricious, was nevertheless erroneous on the law or the facts.

After all, under the bill's provisions, such a stop-work order, effective temporarily, can be secured ex parte, that is, without an opportunity to the employer to submit his defense. We, therefore, proposed an amendment granting such employer the right to sue and recover if the stop-work order were set

aside by the appropriate court. There is nothing unusual in our proposal. Recovery of damages where the agency action is unwarranted or erroneous would accord with law governing review of agency action in section 706 of title 5, United States Code. This section states that the reviewing court shall set aside agency action where it is found to be "unwarranted by the facts to the extent that the facts are subject to trial de novo by the reviewing court."

Nevertheless, our proposal was rejected. Instead, the committee adopted in its place an amendment adding to the permissible grounds for the damage suit—arbitrary or capricious—a third ground, issuance of the stop-work order without reasonable cause. This sounds impressive but it is sheer eye wash and adds nothing at all to the section. Even if such amendment were not included in the bill, such an order issued without reasonable cause would clearly be held by any court in the land to be arbitrary or capricious or both. Its adoption not only adds nothing, but is misleading in creating the false impression that something has been done in behalf of the damaged enterprise. We will, therefore, offer our amendment to the whole House when the bill reaches the floor.

In conclusion, we strongly urge our colleagues to support our three proposals. If they do and are added to the committee measure, we will have succeeded in producing an occupational health and safety bill which will permit the necessary job to be done while providing adequate safeguards for all whom its provisions affect.

WILLIAM H. AYRES,
ALBERT H. QUIN,
CHARLES E. GOODELL,
JOHN M. ASHERBROOK,
JOHN DELLENBACK,
MARVIN L. ESCH,
EDWIN D. ESELEMAN,
WILLIAM A. STEIGER.

HON. HORACE KORNEGAY

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1968

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a sad day for me as we pay departing tribute to HORACE KORNEGAY. HORACE has been both a close friend and a mentor to me since my arrival in the House of Representatives.

The fact that HORACE has decided to sacrifice a brilliant career in public service to spend more time with his wife and family speaks more eloquently of the man than I could ever do. And considering his tremendous dedication to the cause of our Government, I can only say that his absence will provide quite a vacuum in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, the people of North Carolina's Sixth District are the real losers in his decision, even though I feel a great personal loss myself. They are losing one of the most dedicated men I have met in the House. They are losing one of the finest gentlemen ever to grace the Halls of Congress.

I have had many occasions to seek HORACE's counsel during my 4 years in Congress. To say the least, he has on each occasion been gracious, helpful, responsive, and understanding. These, I submit, are the qualities of a good friend.

I shall miss HORACE KORNEGAY as I am

sure every Member of this body will. I bid him well and trust that the future will provide him with good health, happiness, and frequent cause to return to the Hill.

"PUEBLO" PARALYSIS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I hope sincerely that a flag will fly in front of every American home next Sunday to tell everyone everywhere that we do remember the U.S.S. *Pueblo*.

More than 6 months have passed, and the *Pueblo* and its crew are still in the hands of the North Koreans.

It is essential that our Government press every effort to obtain the immediate release of the men and our ship.

I include with my remarks an editorial from the July 15 edition of the Buffalo, N.Y., Evening News:

"PUEBLO" PARALYSIS

Every American must sympathize with the understandable impatience and anguish expressed by mothers and other members of the families of the 82 *Pueblo* crew members held captive for almost six months in North Korea.

But sympathy, of course, won't free the hapless victims of what the administration was denouncing in late January as an unacceptable "act of war." Their families have all too much reason to fear that they are undergoing privation and intimidation. Pictures of some crewmen and statements attributed to them support such fears. So do the experiences of U.S. military personnel who underwent torture as North Korean prisoners during the Korean war.

To their families' pleas for stronger action, including the use of force if necessary, the State Department responds—in the words of one spokesman last month—that such actions "might demonstrate that we are a strong nation, but we see no advantage to bringing out a charred hull and 82 corpses."

A realistic assessment this may well be—at least now, if not in the immediate aftermath when the *Pueblo* seizure was prompting Washington threats of reprisal for an "act of piracy." Today's very contrast with that mood, indeed, is what causes the administration's posture now to inspire so little confidence that its diplomatic efforts will be availing.

For what makes this episode so frustrating—and almost certainly a major political albatross for the administration in the election campaign—is the plaguing doubt that all possible diplomatic pressure is being exerted. By all appearances, the *Pueblo* has sunk into a kind of oblivion, with the administration persistently clammung up on questions about any signs of progress in the 18 or so diplomatic talks with the North Koreans, and with reports of other efforts to resolve the deadlock getting noncommittal answers. To a degree, in this as in all diplomatic matters, such a closed-mouth attitude may be proper, especially if a deal with the North Koreans might involve any third-party efforts by Moscow.

The fact remains, however, that the nation's unwillingness to risk any military force, together with an impression of diplomatic helplessness that has gone uncountered, suggests all too much that the *Pueblo*'s men may become pawns in the cold war. But the public will not forget the *Pueblo*; and lacking all the facts to judge the vigor and

earnestness of the administration's rescue attempts, it can only hope that this chapter will not go down as a reverse of the Teddy Roosevelt advice about speaking softly and carrying a big stick.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON—A VETERANS PRESIDENT

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we near the end of our work in the 90th Congress, as chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I would like to give credit to our President for the outstanding role he has played in providing benefits to our veterans of all wars. Lyndon B. Johnson, himself a veteran of World War II, is the first President who has thought enough of this great segment of our population to send comprehensive messages to Congress dealing solely with veterans' affairs.

First, in 1967, President Johnson sent us a list of proposals which he felt were absolutely necessary if America were to fulfill its obligations, not only to the veterans of the Vietnam era, but also to those who had served in previous conflicts. Again this year, on January 31, 1968, we received another impressive message which reflected his concern and his desire to provide meaningful benefits to all who have served this Nation in time of conflict.

In addition to these two unprecedented messages, the President became the first Chief Executive actively to seek and advocate legislation on behalf of our veteran population. Over the years we have provided many benefits, and Presidents have signed into law legislation originating here in Congress. But never before have we had the guidance, the planning, and the unwavering support of a Chief Executive to help formulate and encourage our efforts.

After his second message to Congress, one nationally known veteran publication commented on President Johnson's concern in this manner:

Year after year, the only mention of veterans in an Administration message was an inference that veteran programs should be absorbed in the general welfare systems. When Congress did begin legislative action, the role of the various Administrations seemed to be an intent to kill the measure, or, failing that, to water it down to the lowest possible dollar sign. Then on Jan. 31, 1967, a surprising thing happened. President Johnson sent Congress a message actually urging the solons to enact many needed benefits for veterans and servicemen. As our editorial noted at that time, "It is believed that this special message pertaining to veteran legislation is the first that any President has ever sent to the Congress." . . . We have had to fight so long and so hard for mere crumbs of recognition of the just rights of veterans that it is difficult to realize that the day of the veteran may have come at last. But there is no denying the impressive facts of the record written in recent years. And on the basis of this record there can be no denial of the fact that President Johnson has shown

great concern and initiative on behalf of veterans.

We here in Congress welcomed this change on the part of the administration as much as did the veterans throughout the country. President Johnson called for an extension of service to our veterans beyond anything that had been previously known. In his second message alone, he made 15 legislative and administrative proposals.

Even before we received these messages from the President, Congress had received his support in enacting many new laws for veterans and servicemen. Congress had provided two military pay raises since August 1965. We had passed a new third-generation GI bill to speed the readjustment of returning servicemen through new education, training, medical, and home loan benefits. We had increased the hostile fire pay in combat zones. We had provided a comprehensive military medicare program. And we had passed a \$177 million annual increase in compensation for our service-disabled veterans. We had enlarged the benefits for surviving children and dependent parents of those who died as a result of service-connected injury.

These actions alone made an impressive record for the Johnson administration. But this was only the beginning.

In his message of January 31, 1967, President Johnson asked Congress—

First. To remove the inequities in the treatment of veterans of the present conflict in Vietnam.

Second. To enlarge the opportunities for educationally disadvantaged veterans.

Third. To boost educational allowances under the GI bill.

Fourth. To increase the amount of servicemen's group life insurance.

Fifth. To increase the pensions received by 1.4 million disabled veterans, widows, and dependents.

Sixth. To make certain that no veteran's pension would be reduced as a result of increases in Federal retirement benefits, such as social security.

Congress responded by legislating compensation, pension, medical, and other benefits that put Vietnam veterans on an equal footing with veterans of earlier wars.

We also liberalized and increased educational benefits for veterans, and we provided pension increases and an increase in the subsistence allowance paid to veterans receiving vocational rehabilitation training.

In this message, the President also ordered a comprehensive study of veterans' programs, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs named a special Commission which traveled throughout the United States hearing testimony from veterans and other interested individuals and groups. This Commission, the U.S. Veterans' Advisory Commission, has provided us with a comprehensive report, and already many of their major recommendations are being converted into law. I am sure that the report will serve as a basis for future legislation in the years to come.

The President's concern for veterans was equally apparent in his second

message. He asked again for an increase in servicemen's group life insurance and legislation to protect the veteran against disproportionate pension losses that could result from increases in other income such as social security.

In his second message, he then proceeded to recommend a whole slate of changes and new proposals. He asked that Congress increase the maximum guarantee on GI home loans. Congress has responded by increasing the guarantee to \$12,500, and has provided other incentives which will make it easier for a veteran to secure a GI loan.

The President proposed that benefits of vocational rehabilitation be extended to service-disabled veterans on a part-time as well as full-time basis. We have responded to that request.

But the President did not depend on legislative changes alone. He insisted on a level of service to veterans never known before. At his direction, the Veterans' Administration was already counseling service personnel in Vietnam, in military hospitals, and at many separation centers. All of these efforts were stepped up by order of the President, and to date the VA has briefed more than 336,000 men at six military bases in Vietnam, has provided bedside counseling to 78,000 disabled servicemen in 176 military hospitals, and is providing benefits orientation to men being separated at all of the 287 regular military separation points.

In his message of last January, he ordered into operation brandnew, one-stop service centers to be staffed by all Federal agencies in any manner concerned with veteran matters. In the short span of 3 weeks, the first such centers were placed in operation under the leadership of the VA, and 21 of the centers are now functioning in our major cities. Their mission is to reach out to newly discharged veterans through telephone calls and home visits in addition to interviews conducted at the centers. Already nearly 40,000 Vietnam-era veterans have received this personalized assistance.

The President ordered the expansion of Project 100,000, and its continuation by the Department of Defense. He also continued Project Transition, which aids a veteran in preparation for a job of consequence in industry and Government. These programs for the educationally disadvantaged veteran have proved most successful and a great help to many thousands of veterans.

President Johnson was disturbed that some veterans returning from service to their country had difficulty in finding jobs. He took steps to alter this situation, and veterans are being contacted by the State employment offices offering their help in securing a meaningful job if they were unable to find one on their own.

His Executive order permitted the offering of civil service transitional appointments up to the grade 5 level to veterans who would complete their education while working for the Government.

One of the major concerns of Congress and the veteran organizations had for years been the deteriorating situation in our national cemetery systems. The President courageously pointed up this prob-

lem, and asked that positive steps be taken to insure the right of every veteran to burial in a national cemetery near his home. Action is already underway in the Congress to transfer activities of the cemetery systems to the VA and to make sure that the President's request is fulfilled.

The President's concern was no place more graphically pointed out than in the budget requests for the VA. In each of the past 4 years the VA budget request has increased by about \$300 million annually. This year's budget will total \$7.3 billion. The medical budget of the VA has been expanded over the \$1 billion mark, and is up this year \$58 million over last year's budget, which was equally unprecedented. The largest medical research budget in history is planned for fiscal year 1969.

I would like to point out that during the past 4 years—the 89th and 90th Congresses—37 new laws have been passed for the benefit of our veterans, and three more await the President's signature. It is also important to note that many of these laws are multipurpose—they have many provisions.

President Johnson has been a President of vision. He has made full use of every facility in getting these vital programs into action. He realized the necessity for changes in order to fulfill our commitment and obligation to our veterans. At the same time, he knew the impact that such programs would have on our Nation.

He knew that an increase in pensions and compensation would fulfill the financial needs of our veterans, but at the same time would spur our economy with increased purchasing power. He realized the absolute necessity of providing educational benefits to our veterans, and he realized the impact that an educated citizenry could have on our Nation. He knew that medical care in our VA hospitals must be the best in the world, but at the same time he realized the magnificent contributions to all of mankind such care could produce.

My fellow Texan has been a great President for veterans. The benefit of his accomplishments will continue to be reaped for many years to come by all segments of our population. But there is no one group who will remember with gratitude the actions of a compassionate President more than the veterans of this Nation. He created what will be remembered as the era of the veteran. He will be remembered as the veteran's President.

He has been the veteran's President not only because he recognized fully the imperishable nature of the Nation's obligation to its veterans, but also because he recognized the continuing nature of the strength and stability infused into our national life by veterans in time of peace as well as in war.

This latter belief he described vividly at a reception held in the White House on November 15, 1967, when he said of our veterans.

They are a very great, tremendous, natural resource—and national resource. We ought to realize that and recognize it. Their energies, their ambitions, and their efforts are

going to determine what kind of a country we live in and the kind my grandson lives in.

The President has a constant awareness of what veterans have done and what they can do to build a greater America. So much so that I suspect he is thinking right now—and will be right up to his last day in office—of additional ways he might be able to express our national appreciation of the contribution made by our veterans.

NATIONAL FAMILY HEALTH WEEK

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, on the 23d of July, a resolution sponsored by myself, the Honorable THOMAS E. MORGAN and the Honorable ROBERT DOLE passed the House. This action has been asked by the American Academy of General Practice, which is an organization composed of the family physicians of our country.

Under unanimous consent I submit a National Family Health Week statement for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FAMILY HEALTH WEEK—AN ACTION PROGRAM FOR THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF GENERAL PRACTICE

I. THE ROLE OF THE ACADEMY

American medicine today is in a state of ferment characterized by doctor shortages, rising hospital costs, new technical developments, and increased demand for more efficient health care. In an effort to resolve much of this confusion and unrest, the American Academy of General Practice has embarked on a program aimed at establishing the new specialty of Family Medicine. This adaptation to the needs of a changing society places the Academy in the ideal position of being able to emerge from the present medical chaos as an entity respected for its guidance and activities, and sought after for its demonstrated leadership.

A major problem familiar to the members of our fast-paced society is that as time and energy are claimed by each day's variety of activities, good health is often taken for granted, and efforts to maintain good health are casually neglected. A great lack of public interest and concern for good health is painfully exposed every time smokers nonchalantly accept the dangers of cancer, city-dwellers ignore their needs for fresh air and physical exercise, and the nation's populace still for the most part ignores the simple precaution of an annual physical checkup.

In the light of these realities, now is the appropriate time for the Academy's doctors to initiate a massive educational campaign that will remind people of the blessings of good health, that will stress the importance of maintaining good health, and that will motivate people to strive for good health. Naturally, this would also make the family physician the focal point of national interest in better health care.

II. AN OPPORTUNITY FOR LEADERSHIP

A "National Family Health Week" would be the cornerstone of such an endeavor. It would be an excellent vehicle for mustering doctors, writers, educators, government officials, and other opinion leaders in a unified, respected effort to upgrade national attitudes toward health care. It would be the begin-

ning of a continuing program to make citizens more aware of the virtues and benefits of the present health care system. It would also be a time for mobilizing individuals to rectify the inadequacies of today's system. It would make people more conscious of the need for preventive health care measures. Furthermore, it would reinforce the family doctor's role as a valuable and respected community member who tirelessly serves his patients and their families. Finally, it would reap impressive local and national publicity for the Academy, its goals and objectives.

THE U.S. JUSTICE DEPARTMENT— A JOKE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Ramsey Clark, U.S. Attorney General, and his staff have initiated their vendetta against what they feel to be the criminal threat to America—that is, white racism in home development.

In their search to uncover the bogeyman—"white racism"—Clark's storm troopers grant special concessions to the exclusive all-white neighborhood in the ultraprivate Lake Barcroft area of Falls Church, Va., where Ramsey Clark and family live a segregated peaceful life. After all, he and his liberal neighbors rationalize their immunity from white racism—they would not think of barring anyone because of color. The segregation of "balancism," viz., balance of the bank account does a much better job of neighborhood protection. And Mr. Clark is a gentleman—he would not think of upsetting his white neighbors by suing them as segregationists.

So the controversial Attorney General—who could find no crime while 500 blocks of Washington, D.C., was looted and burned; who saw no criminal threat when the Vice Commissioner of the District of Columbia Council labeled the murder of a white police officer by a black man as "justifiable homicide"; who can find no racial discrimination in his own backyard—was compelled to travel 1,000 miles to his hometown, Baton Rouge, La., to initiate his first open-housing suit against what he regards as evil southern whites. What a sad disappointment—anyone can find racism in the South—we are a national whipping boy.

Now Mr. Clark, who believes in his personal disobedience to the law—he morally objects to the use of wiretap evidence as authorized by Congress to prosecute organized crime and narcotics racketeers, possibly because Abe advises him also—covers it all over by presenting himself as an egalitarian.

Mr. Clark's extremism for equal rights apparently extends to equal riots and disorders. This may explain why he disapproved of initiating his open housing assaults in northern Virginia, Chicago, Detroit, New York, or California. You see, these areas have their equal share of racial disorder while tranquil Baton Rouge has had no riots, burning, or looting. Mr. Clark merely wanted to

make sure Baton Rouge has reason to rise up and demonstrate its "racism," as an example of what he and his race mixers call "reactionism." Or, we might explain his personal discretion by his deep prejudice and hatred for the people of the Deep South in refusing to start his racist action in the North and elsewhere where Congressmen approved of open housing for their constituents by voting for it. It may be he simply wanted to display the raw power of his non-elected office against the law-abiding southerners whose congressmen do not like property stealing any better than horse stealing. Then, too, to undertake open housing suits in the North might defeat Mr. Clark's congressional friends who favorably voted for the socialistic housing experiment. That would go against party loyalty.

Can anyone be so naive as not to understand that the complainant, Paul J. Brown, is not a Louisiana resident, but a Texan, an employee of the U.S. Department of Labor. What a gimmick this is—a taxpayer's servant, a Federal block-buster in league with the Attorney General's office—and from Texas.

Then again this might be the only program by which the Great Society team—the unholy three—can foresee success and acceptability for their dreamchild, a Socialistic Federal housing program under HUD. Possibly they feel they must destroy, by bankruptcy, private builders and developers; then as private construction disappears, their financiers have an uncompetitive chance to educate the people to accept the debacle of socialist housing.

World opinion will judge his action and know what a small, hateful man he must be to loose his vengeance on his own people. If only he could overcome his antiwhite prejudice long enough to prosecute Communists and criminals, what a peaceful country this could be. His problem must be that his colored maid was a student of Dr. Spock and as of yet he has not been able to overcome the handicap.

As it is, his fascism is showing. His motivating interests are never law and order, but such punishments and excuses as he prefers to mete out.

Tyrants are made, not born. In Germany, after Hitler, judges and attorneys general were tried for their crimes of personal discretion against their people. We deal at arms length.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the news clipping from the front page of the Washington Post for July 23, and other news clippings of crimes of violence which seem in no way to motivate our U.S. Attorney General into action—his interest lies only in school and housing crimes from white racism.

The clippings follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 23, 1968]

UNITED STATES FILES FIRST SUIT FOR OPEN HOUSING

NEW ORLEANS, July 22.—Developers of three Baton Rouge subdivisions were charged today with discriminating against Negroes in the first lawsuit filed under the new Federal open housing act.

The suit, filed in U.S. District Court here by the Justice Department, named six Baton

Rouge firms and five of their top officials as defendants.

They were charged with selling houses in the developments only to white persons and engaging "in a pattern or practice of racial discrimination" in their sale.

Durwood Gully, president of Gully Agency, Inc., said in a telephone interview that the allegation in the suit is "untrue" as applied to his firm.

Gully said the person responsible for the charges was Paul J. Brown, whom he described as an executive in the U.S. Department of Labor. He said Brown was shown a house in one of the three subdivisions, Jefferson Terrace, which he wanted to buy with a 100 per cent Veterans' Administration loan.

"The sales person stated that the particular house he mentioned was not available under FHA (Federal Housing Administration) or VA because of the mortgage discount rate, then 7½ or 8 per cent," Gully said.

"That particular house was not advertised as being available under FHA or VA," Gully said. "Thus the allegation per se is untrue." He said there were no Negroes in Jefferson Terrace.

The other two subdivisions are Sherwood Forest Place and Brusilla Place. One of the developers of Sherwood Forest Place said no Negroes had attempted to buy a home there.

Other firms named in the suit were Knippers and Day Real Estate, Inc.; Town and Country Homes, Inc.; K & B Enterprises, Inc.; Myer-Yarbrough Realty, Inc.; and Myer Development Corp.

The Government asked for an injunction to end the alleged discrimination and sought to require that the defendants take "reasonable steps to correct the effects of past discrimination."

Single-family homes will not be covered by the open housing law until Jan. 1, 1970. But the Justice Department was able to use the law because many of the builders' homes in the Louisiana developments were covered by Federal mortgage guarantees.

The law's provisions outlawing discrimination by builders and developers in housing developments constructed under Federal financing or Federally guaranteed loans went into effect immediately when President Johnson signed the bill into law April 11. Homes that individuals have purchased with Federal financing are not covered until 1970.

[The Supreme Court ruled in June that an 1866 law forbids all racial discrimination in the sale and rental of housing. But this law is enforceable only after an individual has filed a suit and won a court order. The 1968 act, under which the Justice Department acted, provides specific enforcement machinery.]

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 23, 1968]

BANK HOLDUPS CONTINUE AS THREE ROB CHILLUM UNIT

Three men robbed a bank at Eastern Avenue and Chillum Road in Prince Georges County today in the ninth area bank holdup since last Wednesday and the fourth in 24 hours.

Today's holdup was at the Riggs Plaza branch of the Central Bank of Maryland, 5823 Eastern Ave., in the Riggs Plaza shopping center just across the District line. It was the third robbery there since January, an official said.

The robbers got an estimated \$1,500 today. The previous eight bank robberies netted bandits more than \$104,000. Some \$36,000 was taken in three holdups yesterday, one in the District and two in Prince Georges County.

ALL ARE ARMED

In today's robbery, the bandits entered the bank about 10:10 a.m., each armed. One vaulted over a counter while the other two

herded three employees and a customer into a back room.

The manager, Bernard Kane, and the unidentified customer each were hit on the head with a gun and suffered superficial injuries.

After the bandits had ransacked four tellers' cages and had run out the door, those in the backroom came out and the manager saw the men in the parking lot. He ran out after them as they drove off, and shouted to employees at a nearby gas station, "Get the license number!"

The bandits fled in what was described as a maroon-colored car with either Maryland or New Jersey license plates. A police lookout said the men were Negroes in their 20s. One was about 5 feet 9, wearing sports clothing and armed with a .38-caliber gun. Another was about 6 feet, wearing a straw hat, sunglasses and carrying a revolver.

The third was described as about 5 feet 3. The National Bank of Washington branch at 3850 South Capitol St. was the first struck yesterday when three bandits entered about 10:30 a.m. They escaped with an estimated \$16,800.

The other two banks held up yesterday were Prince Georges County branches of the Citizens Bank of Maryland. One, at Sheriff Road and George Palmer Highway near the Landover industrial complex, was robbed of \$11,212 by four men at 11:50 a.m. The other, at Indian Head Highway and Audrey Lane in the Eastover shopping center in Oxon Hill, was hit about 7:10 p.m. by five men who fled with \$8,402.

HELD AT GUNPOINT

In the District holdup, three employees and several customers were held at gunpoint by one bandit while two others vaulted the counter and started putting money in a brown paper bag.

The robbers then ran from the bank and disappeared.

During the robbery at the Sheriff Road bank branch, two employees were hit on the head and face with guns, but neither required hospital treatment, according to Prince Georges County police.

Three of the bandits carried revolvers and wore beards or goatees. They told three employees to lie on the floor and directed a fourth to open two cash drawers. After getting the money, they herded the employees into a back room, then fled in a white and maroon car, police said.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, July 24, 1968]

FBI REPORT FOLLOWS DEATH DETAILS: BALLISTIC TESTS MAY UNSNARL INQUEST MYSTERY

(By Nicholas Horrock)

An FBI ballistics expert is expected today to report on which pistol or pistols fired the bullet that last July 14 killed Theodore R. Lawson seconds after he was questioned by police during a looting investigation at 14th and U-sts nw.

It is known that the FBI Laboratory checked five police service revolvers including those carried by two officers transferred to station duty after Mr. Lawson's death and the pistol checked out to 13th Precinct Pvt. Alfred S. Cassinelli.

MISSING WITNESS

Meanwhile Pvt. Cassinelli and Pvt. Gerald W. Adams told newsmen that a key witness to substantiate their version of the confrontation with Mr. Lawson has not been located.

Missing, they said, is Jackson Gilbert Mitchell, of 1825 Vernon-st nw, who Pvt. Adams has testified first called attention to Mr. Lawson's car as the officers investigated the looting of a Safeway Store branch at 1931 14th-st nw.

According to Pvt. Adams, Mr. Mitchell, described as a heavy set Negro man wearing a wide-brimmed straw hat, told him that he

saw stolen goods from the looted Safeway placed in Mr. Lawson's car parked a few hundred feet south of the store.

The testimony is crucial because under police regulations officers may fire at a fleeing felon or in defense of their own lives. If the officers had reason to believe that Mr. Lawson had looted the Safeway (a felony) it might substantiate the use of their guns under present police rules.

Pvt. Cassinelli claimed the informant has been threatened. He did not identify the source of threats. Coroner Richard Whelton issued a plea that "anyone knowing his (Mr. Mitchell's) whereabouts is urged to step forward."

As the hearing before the six-member coroner's jury closed its third day yesterday, Dr. William J. Brownlee, deputy coroner, testified that Mr. Lawson's body had four bullet holes, but none of them showed signs of powder burns.

A large group of civilian witnesses have testified that one police officer held his pistol inside Mr. Lawson's car and fired at the Prince Georges County resident at point-blank range.

Dr. Whelton explained, however, that Dr. Brownlee's testimony did not rule out close-range shooting because the powder flash may have scorched the clothes of the victim and not touched the skin. The body was nude when examined by Dr. Brownlee, testimony revealed. In other cases the clothes have been held by homicide detectives for separate analysis.

Dr. Brownlee said Mr. Lawson died of a bullet which entered his back near the mid-point about 15½ inches from the top of his head and left the body after following a slightly "downward" path from the victim's chest. Two other bullet wounds, neither of which would have been fatal, were found in the victim's shoulder and back. A fourth bullet passed thru Mr. Lawson's forearm, Dr. Brownlee said.

THREE IN THE BACK

He testified that three of the four bullets clearly entered Mr. Lawson's body from the back and that only one slug had actually been recovered in the body. He said Mr. Lawson had an alcohol content in his blood of .2, higher than the level judged as intoxication in automobile cases. Mr. Lawson also apparently had taken a cold tablet or tablets before his death, which Dr. Brownlee acknowledged might have effected the degree of his intoxication.

Also expected to testify today are detectives from the homicide squad who may be able to confirm whether the trunk of Mr. Lawson's car actually contained goods stolen from the store and whether any of these goods bore his fingerprints.

In the first three days of the hearing a strange pattern of sharply contradictory testimony has emerged. A series of civilian witnesses have claimed that Mr. Lawson was first shot by Pvt. Cassinelli seconds after he stepped into his car.

Pvt. Cassinelli, on the other hand, firmly denied last Friday that he fired his pistol during the incident. No civilian witness as yet has been able to identify a single other policeman who fired at the car.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, July 24, 1968]

MURPHY CITES PROBLEMS IN POLICE INTEGRATION: MIXED POLICE PATROLS FAVORED

(By Carole Shifrin)

Public Safety Director Patrick V. Murphy said yesterday that all-Negro police patrols in the District's all-Negro areas was an impossibility at this time.

"The numbers game alone precludes elimination of all white patrols in Negro areas," he said. "I certainly favor integrated patrols and we have been increasing them."

He pointed out that the police force is still only about 23 per cent Negro even tho half the recruits in May and June were Negro. "We're closing the gap but it's a slow process because it's a large department," he added.

He said so far he has preferred that the precincts "voluntarily" integrate their patrols. "That's not to imply that I won't take stronger measures," he said, adding that he would be reviewing it soon.

His comments came at a press conference with Mayor Walter E. Washington, in which the mayor talked at length about police-community relations.

"Police-community relations is a critical problem—one that needs attention, one that needs action," Mayor Washington said. But he declined to say what specific actions he would take.

He also declined to comment on recent Black United Front proposals urging more stringent regulations on police use of guns and the employment of Negro policemen in the city's Negro communities.

Mr. Murphy said a lack of good police community relations was a "problem of not thoroughly understanding complex problems . . . The police don't understand all the problems in the community and the citizens don't understand the complexities of law enforcement . . . They are unhappy with much of the system where the policeman is a visible sign of that system, or of government."

During the press conference, Mr. Murphy also said:

He had received a report from Police Chief John B. Layton on the pros and cons of Chemical Mace and that a decision on its further use in the District would be made soon.

Shotguns are still being carried in a limited number of police cars, mostly those of top officials.

He had asked for a study on whether bank robberies have occurred in institutions where there are armed guards.

Some 150 unemployed District youths will be trained for jobs in police and security work as guards, communications officers, fingerprint technicians and researchers under a newly-approved Labor Department grant.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, July 24, 1968]

TEN DEAD, 18 WOUNDED IN CLEVELAND RIOT; GUARDSMEN DISPATCHED TO SCENE OF SNIPER BATTLE

CLEVELAND, July 24.—Snipers with automatic weapons fought police thru the night and early today, turning a major section of the city's predominantly Negro East Side into a battleground in what was described as a nationwide Black Power plot.

A force of 2600 National Guardsmen, using armored personnel carriers and borrowed trucks from Brink's, Inc., moved into the area at sunrise with orders to "shoot to kill snipers."

Ten persons were killed by gunfire, including three police officers, three snipers and four Negroes apparently caught in the crossfire.

Eighteen other persons, 10 of them policemen, were wounded. Two of the wounded officers are in critical condition.

Police made 53 arrests.

Firebombing, looting and assaults on civilians were widespread.

It was the nation's worst racial disorder since the destructive Washington rioting which followed the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. in April.

MANY FIRES

Apartments, stores and cars were set afire. For two miles along both sides of Superior av, a major thoroughfare, firemen braved sniper fire to battle blazes ignited by molotov cocktails.

The flames raged from East 105th st, in

the area where the snipers were holed up, to the city limits two miles away.

The shooting lasted more than five hours last night and early today. It subsided during a driving rainstorm, then erupted again at an intersection in the heart of a five-block area where the disturbances first broke out.

Mayor Carl B. Stokes, the first Negro ever elected head of a major American city, believed the violence may have been planned.

"There is a definable group involved," he said. "We've been running it down since yesterday afternoon. We were trying to ascertain just what the fragments of information were."

Police said the snipers were using automatic carbines, at least one machinegun, M1 rifles and shotguns.

RELENTS

Gov. James A. Rhodes mobilized the state's 15,200 national guardsmen and sent 4000 of them to Cleveland. Mr. Stokes first requested the troops be kept from the area of violence to give the Negroes a chance "to see if they can control their community." Moments later, he relented and 2000 troops took to the streets.

(Mr. Stokes earlier had phoned Gov. Rhodes, who was in Cincinnati at the National Governors' Conference. The Governor then rushed out of the ballroom during a speech by President Johnson. For the Governor's story, see Page 7.)

Fred "ahmed" Evans, a Black Nationalist leader arrested by three policemen before dawn, told officers he and 17 others instigated the shooting.

"If my carbine hadn't jammed I would have killed you three," police quoted him as saying. "I had you in my sights when my rifle jammed."

BOASTS

Patrolman David Hicks said Evans boasted that he and 17 other men began firing at officers because "you police have bothered us too long." When told that three snipers had been slain, Mr. Evans said, "they died for a worthy cause," according to Mr. Hicks.

"We asked him where his weapon was," said Sgt. Ronald Heinz. "He pointed to busses in front of a house. We found a loaded carbine, five boxes of ammunition and a first-aid kit."

"I believe this is a conspiracy by black militant groups to cause disturbances not only in Ohio but all across the U.S. to prove they are a power to be reckoned with and that they can do anything they want at any time," said State Adj. Gen. S. T. Del Corso, commander of the Ohio National Guard.

FARM BILL LOBBYING

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I mailed the following letter to my House colleagues:

Re H.R. 17126, Extension of Food and Agricultural Act of 1965.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: "Ho-hum. Here comes another Findley memo on the farm bill . . ."

If that's your reaction, I couldn't blame you a bit! The bill still may not make the House floor, but rumors stir once more. The stakes are so high, in terms of cost to taxpayer and damage to our agricultural market system, that I ask your indulgence once more.

Amendments to limit payments will be offered (mine puts the ceiling per recipient at \$10,000). A limit at some level is long overdue. Payments can be justified only in

terms of income support (welfare) for the individual farmer. The present system is backwards: the bigger the farm, the bigger the payments, and vice versa.

You may wish to examine the self-interest of those lobbying for extension of the programs and against limitation on payments.

To illustrate, last week John H. Butterfield, Pana, Ill., stopped to see me with that message. He identified himself as vice-president of the National Corn Growers Association of Boone, Iowa. After he left, I checked public records and found that in 1966 he got \$15,543 in payments.

Last Saturday I got 59 telegrams from Texas people urging extension of the bill without amendment.

A typical message warning that my amendment would "ruin the economy of this country" was from Ercell Givens, Abernathy, Texas.

In 1967 his payments came to \$163,150. An impressive "guaranteed annual income" at taxpayers' expense, wouldn't you agree? Of course, he didn't put the government-payment figure in his telegram. Neither did the others.

So it goes.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY,

Representative in Congress.

P.S.—You can easily check on how big the payments were to those lobbying your office. Ask the document room for: Part 3, Senate hearings on H.R. 10509 (lists individual payments in 1966); Part 2, Senate hearings on H.R. 16913 (lists individual payments in 1967). Fascinating reading.

NEXT HEALTH DIRECTOR: ROBERT QUARLES MARSTON

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on Health and Welfare, I would like to express my great satisfaction with the recent appointment of Dr. Robert Q. Marston as Director of the National Institutes of Health. I am familiar with the fine work that Dr. Marston has done as director of the regional medical program and as Administrator of the Health Services and Mental Health Administration, and I can say with confidence that NIH has a Director who is more than equal to the challenges that will be facing him in the coming years. A recent New York Times article outlining Dr. Marston's credentials gives ample evidence to support my expectations and further demonstrates the reason why we in Congress should be appreciative that such an eminently qualified man has accepted this very important post. I submit this article for the RECORD, as follows:

NEXT HEALTH DIRECTOR: ROBERT QUARLES MARSTON

WASHINGTON, July 18.—On Feb. 1, 1966, Dr. Robert Quarles Marston, a physician and dean of a medical school, took command of a new Federal enterprise that was distrusted and feared by many American doctors. In the 2½ years that have intervened he has so far assuaged these fears that today the regional medical programs on heart disease, cancer and stroke have gained almost nationwide acceptance and—more important—cooperation.

This triumph of diplomacy was one of the reasons the gray haired, soft-spoken Virginian has been named the next director of the National Institutes of Health, one of the world's greatest and most influential institutions for medical and biological research.

At a news conference today, Wilbur J. Cohen, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, cited Dr. Marston's "splendid handling" of the Institutes' division of Regional Medical programs. Dr. Marston will become director Sept. 1 when Dr. James A. Shannon retires after 13 influential years in the post.

ANNOUNCED BY THE WHITE HOUSE

The new appointment was announced yesterday by the White House.

In 1966, Dr. Marston came to his first major administrative post at the National Institutes of Health from the University of Mississippi, where he had been vice chancellor and dean of the medical school. Just a few days before his 43d birthday he took on the job of administering the federally supported enterprise that grew out of the President's commission on Heart Disease, Cancer and Stroke.

It is widely believed that this new group of regional programs would serve to set up a network of regional centers where patients would be given the most up-to-date treatment for these major diseases.

This was the basis for distrust of the program by doctors across the country. They saw the Regional Medical Programs as another Federal intrusion that would take away many of their private patients. Congress had already deleted from the law any possibility that such a network would exist. But the fear remained.

By tireless diplomacy and persuasion, and by drawing critics into the planning of regional programs, Dr. Marston managed to convince most persons that the enterprise was really a series of regional cooperative programs to update the treatment of heart disease, cancer and stroke by education and training.

The new appointment will take Dr. Marston from another important Federal health post that he has held only since April 1. On that date he was named administrator of the new Health Services and Mental Health Administration, a part of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare that has been accorded status equal to that of the National Institutes of Health.

"I find as I look back over the last three or four years that I apparently am having increasing difficulty holding a job," Dr. Marston said today.

From a glance at his biography, no one would judge that lack of talent had anything to do with that difficulty. He was born in Toana, Va., on Feb. 12, 1923 and graduated from Virginia Military Institute in 1943 and the Medical College of Virginia in 1947.

He was a Rhodes Scholar, studying in England under the Nobel Prize-winner, Prof. Howard Florey; served an internship at Johns Hopkins Hospital in Baltimore and a residency at Vanderbilt University and then worked at the Institute on the role of infection after whole body irradiation.

As a Markle Fellow he served at the Medical College of Virginia and then at the University of Minnesota, with subsequent faculty posts at Virginia and the University of Mississippi where he became dean of medicine in 1961.

He is married to the former Ann Carter Garnett. They have three children, Ann, Robert and Wesley and despite work-days that begin early in the morning at his office in Bethesda and end late in the evening, often with conferences at his home, he does find time for family affairs.

This spring, for example, he was able to salvage enough time from his administrative

post to take the family on a sailing and camping vacation in the Caribbean.

Dr. Marston, a spare man of above average height, has gray hair of a shade that could reasonably be called "distinguished."

"We did that to him," said an aide at the National Institutes of Health. A friend denied that this was so. There has been gray in his hair since medical school and the pace of administrative duties in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare seems only to have increased it somewhat.

ROBERT ACOSTA: BLINDNESS WAS NOT HIS GREATEST HANDICAP

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, in a school district the size and quality as that of the city of Los Angeles, there is bound to be a number of highly gifted, dedicated teachers. Robert Joseph Acosta, a teacher at Chatsworth High School, located in the San Fernando Valley section of Los Angeles, numbers among the best.

Yet, years ago when, after completion of two academically distinguished years at the University of California at Los Angeles, he applied for entrance into the school of education, school authorities resisted. They acknowledged his accomplishments: though born into an often maligned minority group in California as the son of Mexican-American laborers, he was a fine athlete, a camp counselor, a superior scholar, a member of the student council and of several student societies at his high school as well as vice president of his senior class there, and an A-average student at UCLA. But he suffered from what officials choose to call an insurmountable handicap. You see, Robert Acosta is blind. No blind person had ever earned a teaching credential from UCLA. "It could not be done."

What UCLA officials did not realize is that it could be done. It took an extraordinary young man to prove it, and Robert Acosta is such a man.

In spite of a congenital birth defect that left him 100-percent blind in both eyes, young Acosta joined the YMCA, learned to swim at an early age, participated in wrestling, track, weight lifting, horseback riding, water skiing, hiking, touch football, basketball, and even archery.

After the sixth grade he attended a regular junior and senior high school where he proved his leadership ability and achieved the academic distinction I have just mentioned.

Acosta did not despair or change his goal of becoming a teacher after having been refused admission to the school of education at UCLA. He continued his campaign and finally was accepted—with some reluctance—by the school of education at California State College at Los Angeles. Their attitude was one of skepticism—unjustified, it seems, because Acosta maintained an A average and became the first totally blind student to earn a teaching credential from the school.

Mr. Speaker, time does not permit my mentioning every obstacle faced by this extraordinary young man before he convinced school authorities to give him a classroom. Suffice to say that his greatest handicap was not his blindness, but the skepticism of those in the sighted world.

Manteca High School in northern California finally agreed to take a chance, and Robert Acosta embarked upon his professional career.

As a teacher, a professional, and a blind man, there was a lot to be done. The road was not easy, but he more than achieved his goal of being a "good" teacher. Administrators of Chatsworth High School, where he now teaches, describe him as a "very remarkable young man, an inspiration to all, ability well above the average, outstanding for a young teacher, certainly as good or much better than the majority of teachers."

Mr. Speaker, these words make no mention of Robert Acosta's blindness, or of the fact that he is the first blind teacher in the Los Angeles elementary and secondary school system. He is simply another who has joined the ranks of those who rate as superior among the teachers in the Los Angeles school system—he is but another who has furthered his education by earning a masters degree, by achieving a relationship with his students based on mutual respect. Like other "good" teachers the esteem with which he is held can be measured by the number of additional responsibilities he is asked to shoulder. And so, Mr. Speaker, in addition to his classroom duties, Acosta has been and is an adviser to several student organizations, including the Future Teachers of America.

Robert Acosta is not satisfied with simply being successful at his chosen profession for he knows of the problems he faced in becoming a teacher and is determined to overcome the negative attitudes of the sighted world. To help change this attitude among sighted people and to instill drive and ambition among young blind people, he has founded the Blind College Students of Southern California, an organization devoted to working out the students' problems with continuing education and future employment. He is also founder and chairman of the Blind Teachers of Southern California organization, and has founded a chapter of the California Council of the Blind. Last year he organized and chaired a conference of blind teachers and students in Los Angeles. The purpose of this conference was to share experiences, problems, and strengths between the blind delegates, and to educate the many school officials who attended to the fact that blind teachers can do well.

Mr. Speaker, Robert Acosta is not seeking to serve as an inspiration to anyone—teacher, Mexican-American or blind person—though his demeanor and his success are, indeed, inspirational. Rather, he seeks to prove that with courage and determination, with self-help rather than with charity his fellow blind contemporaries can become independent, contributing citizens. He is taking dy-

namic, positive action as a leader and worker to make his belief a reality. By helping build pride and self-confidence in the blind, Robert Acosta is taking them out of darkness.

THE STEEL INDUSTRY

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the occasion to write a letter to the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee regarding a vital aspect of this Nation's economy—the steel industry.

Under unanimous consent I include the text of this letter in the RECORD at this point:

JULY 12, 1968.

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MILLS: Seventeen members of the Congressional delegation from the great State of Ohio, along with 78 members from other states on both sides of the aisle, and in the Senate 36 Senators have introduced or sponsored legislation for the orderly control and fair trade on Iron and Steel Imports.

I personally am vitally interested in this critical and important legislation in my District I have the Executive Headquarters of a large steel company as well as a large steel plant which employs in excess of 6000 people. Seventeen percent of all the steel produced in the United States originates in Ohio, it is a vital part of the economy of the State, only the State of Pennsylvania produces more.

Over 100,000 people are employed in Ohio steel plants, making the steel industry the second largest employer in the state (out-ranked only by the automotive industry). The steel industry has the second largest payroll in the state—nearly \$1 billion in hourly wages and salaries annually. This is an important group of taxpayers.

It is quite clear that what happens to steel in Ohio, is not only important to all of us in Ohio, but to all in the United States. You can rest assured what happens to steel in Ohio will also happen to the steel industry in other states.

In 1957 imports of steel mill products were 1.2 million tons and accounted for 1.5 percent of the market in the United States. By 1967, imports reached 11.5 million tons—representing 12.2 percent of the domestic market. While imports increased tenfold during this period exports decreased 68 percent—from 5.3 million tons in 1957 to 1.7 million tons last year, of which about one-third were government financed A.I.D. programs. At the present levels, the adverse balance of trade in steel mill products is approximately \$1 billion. It is estimated the 11.5 million tons of imported steel in 1957 reduced employment opportunities in the basic industry in this country by some 70,000 jobs.

It is alarming to note recent reports that in the first five months of 1968 steel imports amounted to 6,651,500 tons with a value of \$735,563,000. The percentage change over the same period of 1967, represents an increase of 56%.

I would like to quote for the record information recently received from the American Iron and Steel Institute.

"On an annual basis the rate of imports during the first five months this year is equivalent to a record-shattering 16 million

tons, said the Institute. The highest previous annual total was nearly 11.5 million tons during 1967.

"Meanwhile, exports of steel mill products from the United States declined to 132,000 net tons during May and 623,000 tons during the first five months this year, indicating an annual total of about 1.5 million tons, against nearly 1.7 million tons last year.

"In April 1968 the export figure was 136,504 tons. During the first five months last year the figure was 853,081 tons.

"The valuation of steel imports exceeded the valuation of steel exports by almost \$582 million during the first five months of this year, against a difference of more than \$296 million during the first five months of 1967. These figures do not include freight charges, insurance and allowance for government-financed exports, which, if included, would further increase the dollar deficit in this country's steel trade.

"The valuation of imports during May was a record \$187,427,000, an increase of over 63 percent from \$114,949,000 in May 1967, and almost \$162 million in April 1968. The total for the first five months of 1968 was \$735,563,000, against \$498,319,000 during the comparable part of last year, an increase of almost 48 percent. Export valuations were: \$32,528,000 in May 1968, and \$153,737,000 in the first five months of 1968.

"The May 1968 import tonnage was up nearly 72 percent from 1,030,079 in May 1967.

"The tonnage increase in the first five months of 1968 was 2.4 million tons, from 4,266,007 tons arriving during the identical part of last year.

"May was the sixth consecutive month in which the import figure exceeded 1 million tons."

On June 18th, Mr. Thomas Patton, Chairman of Republic Steel Corporation and Mr. I. W. Abel, President of the United Steel Workers of America appeared before your Committee and gave complete and thorough information on the critical need for immediate action and adoption by Congress of the Iron and Steel Orderly Trade Act. I have had the opportunity of reading their testimony and am in complete support and congratulate these gentlemen on their excellent statement.

We are faced, Mr. Chairman, with a real challenge in the United States today. We have reason for great concern over our balance of payments deficit. Restricting steel imports would prevent further increases in the adverse balance of trade in steel mill products which have grown at a rate averaging \$155 million a year over the last ten year period.

A ready supply of a wide variety of steel mill products is essential to our national security. So long as steel is a material which is essential to our economy and our national security, can we afford to depend on foreign sources for these vital needs? To supply our requirements, the steel industry must be capable on short notice to produce the entire range required. Unless the rising trend in steel imports is soon arrested, can the steel industry make the capital investments to provide necessary additional producing and processing equipment required to prevent serious bottlenecks in time of war? Even if funds were available—in the event of a national emergency—precious time would be required to build and install the required facilities, and additional time to secure, train and develop the skills of the people required to operate the facilities. Can we afford as a Nation to be in this position?

An article in *The Wall Street Journal* of March 22nd, under the title, "Detroit vs. Imports"—states as follows:

"Imported cars once more are causing U.S. auto makers to press the panic button. Import sales soared to 773,000 cars last year up 17% from 1966. So far this year imports are selling at an annual rate of a million cars."

This represents additional importation of

foreign steel, with further impact on our steel producers, jobs and employment of American workers.

In conclusion, I strongly urge your Committee to report out legislation immediately as provided in the Iron and Steel Orderly Trade Act. Not a foreign trade barrier, not free trade but fair trade and an Act to control and regulate the importation of steel and the sharing of our growth in these markets with foreign producers on an orderly basis.

Thank you for your consideration and any assistance you can give.

Sincerely,

DONALD E. LUKENS.

TETSUO TOYAMA: LIVING PROOF OF THE AMERICAN DREAM

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, from its birth, America has been the mecca for immigrants. People have come to our shores from all parts of the world, seeking—and usually finding—a new life.

In the process, they have contributed to the greatness of the United States through their energies and talents.

During the recent celebration of the 100th anniversary of the arrival of the first Japanese immigrants in Hawaii, tribute was paid to those first brave voyagers who ventured from their homes in Asia to the Hawaiian Islands. The contributions which these pioneers from the Far East have made to life in Hawaii will always be a part of the unique culture found in the Island State.

One of the most distinguished and well-known elder members of Hawaii's Japanese community is 86-year-old Tetsuo Toyama, who helped to plan the 100th anniversary celebration. Mr. Toyama has played a major role in improving the status of the immigrant in Hawaii, and for this he was recently presented an award by the Emperor of Japan. A strong advocate of the American way of life, Mr. Toyama helped to organize the Naturalization Encouragement Association of Honolulu shortly after the passage of the Walter-McCarran Act in 1952 to assist immigrant residents in obtaining American citizenship. Then to lend further assistance to the newly naturalized citizens, he organized the Citizens Study Club of Oahu. Both of these organizations have been noted for their dynamic programs and have remained active to this day. Proud of his American citizenship, this remarkable octogenarian is also the author of a soon-to-be published book entitled "Hachijyun Kaiko-Shi"—"My Life, 80 Years." The English version of the book will be called "Free Life in Hawaii."

I believe my colleagues will find of great interest the reminiscences of this revered Hawaii citizen, and I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the feature article about Mr. Toyama written by Honolulu Advertiser staff writer Patsy Matsuura which appeared in the June 9, 1968, edition of the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser.

I am also pleased to submit for inclusion in the RECORD a very warm and poignant salute "To the Issei—first generation—from Nisei—second generation—by Andrew Matsunaga, from the June 20, 1968, issue of the Citizen:

[From the Sunday Star-Bulletin & Advertiser, Honolulu, June 9, 1968]

TETSUO TOYAMA CAME A LONG WAY: POVERTY TO PLENTY

(By Patsy Matsuura)

Tetsuo Toyama is a man of action—a real live wire. At 86 when most people are turning to the comforts of their rocking chairs, he is editing a newspaper, "The Citizen," and waiting for his book, "Hachijyunen Kaiko-Shi" (My Life—80 Years), to be published in August.

When we called at his Puunui home one afternoon Toyama was rummaging through stacks of magazines, photographs and newspapers. He only stopped long enough to grant us an interview.

Leaning back in a comfortable chair, he recalled his life before he left Okinawa, his birthplace.

"Okinawa very poor," he began. "I wanted to get away, but my mother stopped me. She said I already fought in the Russian-Japanese War and was shot in the arm so she didn't want anything else to happen to me."

"So I took a test given by the police department, but I flunked on purpose so that I didn't have to stay in Okinawa anymore. My mother gave up. She said, 'You go if you like.'"

NEW LIFE

That was the beginning of a new life for young Toyama, then 24. He sailed on the Siberia-Marui with 12 other Okinawans to work in the cane fields of Kekaha, Kauai. The year was 1906.

"We worked hard," he recalled. "We kachicane . . . hoe hana . . . hapal-ko (cut, weed and carry the cane). We make only seven cents an hour . . . 70 cents a day. Sunday we holoholo (go out for pleasure)."

One day Toyama said the plantation managers told him if he could find 30 laborers to work in the fields, they would pay him \$20 a month.

He accepted the offer and began an endless search for workers on all the Kauai plantations. In Kaola they accused him of stealing the men and sent the plantation policeman after him.

"I run out on the public highway," he chuckled. "You can't get arrested once you're on public property."

"I search all over and find only six men. I need 24 more, so I go back to my camp and write to Nippu Jiji (now The Hawaii Times) in Honolulu."

"My article came out in the paper. It read, 'Welcome to Kekaha . . . beautiful place. We pay \$20 . . . all other plantations pay only \$18.'"

"We end up with 400 men!" he exclaimed. "We form the Kehaha Okinawa Kenjin-kai (social club comprised of people who came from Okinawa). I was the first president."

Because he successfully recruited the men, Toyama was paid \$20 a month thereafter. He was not required to work.

"I don't like to holoholo so I cook for the men," Toyama said. "And I open a furo-ba (bath house) and become 'furo boss.'"

STRIKE AGAINST HIM

"One day the men learned that I was being paid \$20 for doing nothing so they became jealous. They make 'against Toyama' strike. Everybody quit."

The plantation managers and the Kuramoto Store where Toyama's Okinawan friends patronized, asked him to stay on despite the strike.

"But I quit," he said firmly. "Then the strike pau. I go Hanapepe to become a fisherman. But I had hard luck. The storm and

big waves hit my boat . . . it broke. This time I go Honolulu and stay one week. Then I go Pauilo, Hawaii, to work on the sugar plantation. One day my friend, Katsuren Yamato, who was working in the sugar mill, fell into the big pot of boiling sugar and died. Oh, it was terrible," he said sadly.

Toyama left the plantation and became a salesman for Miyasaki Grocery Store in Pahau, Hawaii. In the mornings he cut sugar cane leaves which were fed to the 11 horses that the Miyasakis owned, and in the afternoons he took orders from the customers and delivered the goods.

In 1912 he returned to Honolulu and started the magazine, "Jitsugyono Hawaii Journal" (Industry of Hawaii) in an office located on King Street.

PICTURE BRIDE

Two years later he married a young woman from Okinawa. "She was a picture bride," Toyama explained. "When my parents sent me her picture I said to myself, 'Ah, this nice.'"

"We write letters for one year. I am a Christian so I tell her to get baptized before she come here. We married Nov. 30 at a Methodist Church on River Street. My wife, Sada, taught school in Okinawa and at Kallhi Japanese School for many years."

Toyama said when Hawaii was attacked on Dec. 7, 1941, he was among the Japanese people sent to Relocation Camps. During that time he said he attended Union College in Nebraska and studied American history, English, Bible Doctrine and the New Testament.

Because his son, Sadao, was serving with the 100th Infantry Battalion, Toyama was released after two and a half years at the Relocation Center.

Writing has always been his favorite hobby so in 1954 he started the newspaper, "The Citizen," for those who can read Japanese as well as English, and for those who are eligible for citizenship. His wife assists in the business.

PRESENTED AWARDS

Because of his valuable contributions to the community, Toyama has been presented many plaques and awards. He visited the Ryukyu Islands in 1960 to receive an award "for his contribution to the guidance of the compatriot immigrants in Hawaii and the improvement of their social status." It was signed by Seisaku Ota, chief executive of the government of the Ryukyus.

Another award was given to him by William F. Quinn, then governor of Hawaii, who praised Toyama for accepting the grave responsibility of establishing "The Citizen."

He received a medal from the American Legion in 1953 for being the outstanding adult school student at Farrington where he was studying to become an American citizen. A plaque was presented to him in 1960 in recognition of his being chosen the outstanding citizen.

In 1958 when 150 people were naturalized in Judge Frank McLaughlin's court, Toyama said he was asked to give a talk in English. "I told them I only speak broken English, but they say that's okay. I was scared."

"Next morning the Japanese paper had a story about me," he said unfolding an old clipping. In the article was a small paragraph written by the court secretary and printed in English. It read in part . . . "You made a better speech than if we had warned you. It was meant right from the heart and you meant every word of it."

CHURCHGOERS

The Toyamas are devout Christians and attend Alea Seventh Day Adventist Church every weekend. They have a son and daughter, both married.

"I have faith in Jesus Christ," he emphasized. "He saved my life many times. I used to drink one gallon of sake every day from six

in the night to five in the morning until I was 50, but I was able to give it up because of my faith in Jesus Christ. Today I think I am the luckiest man in the world."

"If our young people get a good education, attend church and have faith they won't go wrong," he said when asked his views about the generation gap.

What about the collegians who are conducting themselves so shamefully?

"They're sick . . . they're communistic," he retorted. "I hate Communists. My newspaper has been fighting communism for 40 years."

What is his aim in life?

"I want to work toward a good government . . . a good Hawaii. And I want to see more young Japanese people turn out to be like Dan Inouye and Spark Matsunaga."

Regarding his soon-to-be published book, Toyama said it took him three years to assemble. It would have been ready sooner, but he said he decided to insert the Japanese Centennial celebration events in the book.

The edition, being published in Japan, will have about 1,000 pages—700 in Japanese and 300 in English with 100 pictures to illustrate the story. The English version will be called "Free Life in Hawaii."

A LITTLE SAD

Referring to the 100th anniversary celebration, Toyama said he is happy, but at the same time a little sad when he thinks about the Isseis (first generation) who toiled in the cane fields.

"Women work hard, too," he emphasized. "They tie babies on their backs and hoe hana all day, then go home to cook and wash clothes."

"I'm glad I lived long enough to observe the centennial. This will be our first and last," he said with a trace of sadness in his voice.

Yes, Tetsuo Toyama the citizenmaker has come a long way since he left the poverty of Okinawa for the paradise of the Pacific.

Today at 86, his head is partially bald and whatever hair is left has turned completely gray, but he hasn't lost his zip nor his wit. He's truly a remarkable man . . . he's "Ichiban" (number one).

[From the Citizen, June 20, 1968]

A SALUTE TO THE ISSEI FROM NISEI

(By Andy Matsunaga)

The centennial celebration of the Japanese immigrants' arrival in Hawaii poses a poignant hour in the lives of the niseis, sanseis, and yonseis of Hawaii. It is the last conventional celebration we may ever have together. It is our last chance to pay tribute to them together. It is time to say our last "arigato."

An old man long past the age of "Kanreki," in fact age 86, standing straight upon his feet, head up high, looking straight into the eye—asked, "What do you young people think is the most valuable gift we isseis leave behind for Hawaii?—And we are as a child, unable to make known the sudden surge of emotion within; feeling faint at the task of trying to explain."

Coming to these remote volcanic islands under a three year labor contract, these young bachelors came to work. Reminiscent of the men of the Bounty on Pitcairn Island, these young, virile, travelers came abandoning themselves to follies, no time to care about morality or ethics, so long as they lived within the laws for the next three years. Then—they would return to their homes in Japan with the fruits of their labor to live out their normal lives. Theirs was a topsyturvy community based upon this dizzy dream.

Today, these men—those who survived—are in the trough of their lives, aged and weak, but proud, and thankful to the Almighty God who led them to this land; showed them the spark of hope, and enabled them to face many difficulties through days

of loneliness, sorrow, joy, sunshine, darkness and horror.

By characteristics a nature loving, song loving and God oriented people, the immigrant families left a refrain of nostalgic, interpretive music called the "hole hole bushi" which tell the tale of longing, hard labor, languishing and drifting and of drowning their dreams, getting drunk on "sake" and Okolehau.

The availability of alcoholic spirits and the frightening scarcity of women set the stage for lawlessness, fighting, callousness and immorality. The setting was ripe for the natural story of the race of man, exposed to the sun and the sea, being beckoned by the "beautiful siren" of debauchery and degradation and disease.

Here emerged the spirit of the frontiersman, just as we read of the American settlers:

"His echoing axe the settler swung"

Amid the sea of solitude,
And rushing, thundering, down were flung,
The Titans of the wood."

We have reports of the second Consul General of Japan drinking and gambling all night, and his brave, dutiful wife taking out the wooden tubs of some rare and precious "sake" which had just been sent from the immigrants ship, "Wakanoura Maru" and how she destroyed and drained every drop of it. There was great wrath and emotion in the man but the courage of the act of the little woman brought him back to his senses and helped him back to leading a sober and exemplary life.

We know of the Unionization and the tragic strikes and the heroes who staked their lives and fortunes for peace and understanding between Plantation and labor, when sentiments ran high among the different races in labor.

In the "passing parade," we see the sterling character of a school teacher offering his life to the education of the Japanese children, working for no pay. The picture-bride parade, the mysterious Flu epidemic which threatened to wipe-out the entire population. The struggle for hospitals and School buildings. The touchy question of ex-patriation of their children, and the Americanization of the non-American Isseis.

Out of the confusion or infusion of Buddhism, Shintoism, Kahuna and Confucius evolved a lay religion of understanding and tolerance and a respect for the other man's worth, and this mutual respect was like a leaven unto the races. Out of this infusion of the races you did all within your power to perpetuate the best customs of your cultural background. You emphasized education for your children. Built schools and libraries even you struggled to pay the assessment. Much of your discipline, manners and courtesies were more caught than taught.

So much of your censure and your sacrifices were for love of your children, the influence of your steadiness of purpose and your ability to change and to face-up to and adapt to the newer aspects of life, the spirit of good faith, and loyalty you had instilled in your young had stood them in good stead as they were faced with their choice in their Valley of Decision.

Today the complex world demands the highest type men to lead it through the morass of mixed-up ideologies, highly sophisticated technology, and from your offspring America has begun to reap the benefits of the wisdom and foresight and courage of such Americans as Senator Dan Inouye and Congressman Spark Matsunaga and an array of men and women in high places of the nation and the world.

This is your legacy, this is what History shall claim of you. For history can claim no greater gift than this you have given to Hawaii and the world, your children, to whom you had shown the ways from which they shall not depart.

I looked up into the eyes of the old man and there were tears.

FOR THE PROTECTION OF FOREIGN SERVICE AND FUTURE USIA INFORMATION OFFICERS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, scheduled for consideration by the House this week is S. 633, a bill to establish a Foreign Service Information Officer Corps similar to the Foreign Service system which now exists in the Department of State. This measure would grant to USIA officers the right of tenure similar to that of Foreign Service officers. As the House knows, this so-called tenure is far inferior to the tenure given to other civilian employees of the Government who have available to them statutory appeals and grievance procedures. This is hardly the best way to recruit qualified people for USIA, and corrective legislative amendments are clearly in order.

I have introduced H.R. 16408 which is essentially the same as S. 633 with two amendments added. The original version of S. 633 contained a veterans' preference provision which was later modified. My first amendment would reinstate the original veterans' preference arrangement.

Second, an appeals procedure would be established to give USIA Foreign Service information officers, along with Foreign Service officers a means of redress in the event of selection out of the agency involved.

An illustration of the merit of these amendments can be gleaned from the Otto Otepka and Stephen Koczak cases which I have dealt with at length in the recent past. While both men were veterans, Otepka has appeal rights while Koczak had no such recourse. The explanation is that Foreign Service officers in the State Department have no appeal rights and can be selected out without redress, which is exactly what happened to Koczak. In the case of Otto Otepka, had he been in the Foreign Service instead of holding a position covered by civil service his case would have been brushed under the rug by the State Department without the ensuing embarrassment. The Veterans' Preference Act is the statutory basis for the appeals procedure. Later, by Executive order, this was extended to nonveteran employees. Unfortunately for Koczak, the Foreign Service is still without this basic recourse.

If the following article is an indication, I wonder just how helpful the appeals procedure will be in Otto Otepka's case. The Government Employees Exchange of July 24 quotes our present Ambassador to the United Nations, George Ball, as having said that if he becomes Secretary of State, Otepka will not even get into the State Department Building, let alone retain the security position for which he is so well qualified. If the Civil Service rules in favor of Otepka and he is reinstated to his former security position, a future Secretary of State Ball would presumably

be hamstrung in bouncing Otepka. However, in view of the sordid machinations which have taken place to date in the Otepka case, it would not be surprising if Ball found a way.

Under unanimous consent I include the article, "Ball for Rusk if H. H. H. Elected," from the Government Employees Exchange of July 24 in the Record at this point:

BALL FOR RUSK IF H. H. H. ELECTED—"TROUBLEMAKER OTEPKA" NOT TO GET INTO STATE

George Wildman Ball has informed his closest friends that Otto F. Otepka would "not ever return" to his post as top Security Evaluator at the State Department if Hubert Humphrey is elected President of the United States. *The Exchange* learned from a high source who attended a meeting with Mr. Ball abroad.

According to the authority, who met Mr. Ball overseas, Mr. Ball was "furious" with *The Exchange* and with Senator Strom Thurmond for "embarrassing" him during the Senate proceeding leading to Mr. Ball's confirmation by a 3-2 voice vote as the United States Ambassador to the United Nations.

Mr. Ball had explained he was especially troubled because, as a result of the attending publicity about his role in connection with the State Department's electronics laboratory, it looked "for a time" as if Mr. Humphrey might decide to revise his present intention to groom Mr. Ball to succeed Dean Rusk as Secretary of State.

ELECTRONICS LAB

However, the source was informed, Mr. Ball now considers that the "danger of further congressional interest" in the State Department's electronics laboratory has passed and that he, once again, has every reason to hope that he would be the next Secretary of State.

"That trouble-maker Otepka will not even get into the building when that happens," Mr. Ball was reported as confiding to his closest friends.

DOCUMENTARY PROOF

Readers of this newspaper will recall that Mr. Ball's "embarrassment" arose over the fact that *The Exchange* had submitted documentary evidence in the form of a building diagram clearly showing that an "electronics laboratory" did exist at the State Department, and it provided other evidence that the laboratory was controlled by Mr. Ball during his incumbency as Under Secretary of State.

(Reluctant at first to admit reporters to see the "electronics laboratory," the State Department finally consented. It was explained away by guides that it was an "electronics repair shop.")

Although the original source of *The Exchange's* information was a former Central Intelligence Agency Officer who had helped in setting up the laboratory, *The Exchange* submitted documentary evidence to Senator J. William Fulbright, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and to Representative John Ashbrook, only after Mr. Ball had challenged the veracity of this newspaper by denying the existence of the facility.

BALL'S DENIAL

During the hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, on May 3, Senator Fulbright asked Mr. Ball whether the information contained in *The Exchange* was correct. Mr. Ball replied as follows: "I certainly would have been aware of it had there been such a room, had there been such a device and there was none. There is none."

Following these events, on May 13, during a long, detailed statement on the Senate floor reviewing Mr. Ball's role in "bugging" Mr. Otepka's telephone, and about the documentation supplied by *The Exchange*, Sena-

tor Thurmond announced that he would vote against Mr. Ball's confirmation.

CONDONE FALSEHOOD

In further reviewing Mr. Ball's role in connection with the resignation under threat of perjury charges of former Assistant Secretary of State, John Rieley, Mr. Thurmond stated that Mr. Ball's proceedings in the perjury case of the three State Department officials was "not the course of action that would be followed by a man who is interested in being straight-forward with the Congress."

Senator Thurmond added that, in Mr. Ball's case, "the effect of these actions is to condone falsehood."

HUMPHREY'S PLANS

Asked to elaborate about Mr. Ball's "hope" to be the next Secretary of State, the source revealed that Mr. Ball had disclosed to friends that his "sudden" appointment by President Johnson as the United States Ambassador to the United Nations and Mr. Goldberg's "sudden" departure were the result of the intervention of Vice President Humphrey, who had informed the President that Mr. Ball would be his choice for Secretary of State if he were elected.

HUGHES REPLACING KATZENBACH

Mr. Ball further confided to his friends that Mr. Humphrey now is considering appointing Thomas L. Hughes, currently the State Department's Director of Intelligence and Research, as the Under Secretary of State, to replace Nicholas deBelleville Katzenbach. Mr. Hughes had previously served with Mr. Humphrey as Legislative Counsel when the Vice President was Senator, the source said.

RIELLY TO WHITE HOUSE

Questioned whether Mr. Ball or the source had any information about other plans of Mr. Humphrey regarding top appointments, the informant revealed that Mr. Ball was already communicating with the Vice President on a regular basis through John Rieley, currently Mr. Humphrey's Staff Assistant on Foreign Policy. It is anticipated Mr. Rieley would assume a position in the White House similar to the one President Kennedy assigned to McGeorge Bundy, the source said.

In an aside, the informant told *The Exchange* that Mr. Humphrey reportedly regretted very much the departure from the State Department of William J. Crockett, the controversial former Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration.

CROCKETT ESTEEMED

Mr. Crockett, the source stated, has proved to be very sympathetic to the needs of Mr. Humphrey in the past, by placing close associates of the Vice President on the State Department payroll as "domestic foreign service reserve officers." Among these was John Rieley, serving in the immediate office of the Vice President in the new Senate Office Building but then and currently paid by the State Department as a "foreign service" employee.

THE HAYS BILL

Readers of *The Exchange* will recall that, besides establishing without congressional approval a new category, "domestic" foreign service reserve officer, Mr. Crockett was the principal advocate of the Hays Bill, which would have subjected all civil service employees to conversion to foreign service status, and make them subject to "selection-out" without any appeals procedure. The Hays Bill would have also removed the protection of the Lloyd-LaFollette Act, allowing Federal employees to petition Congress, and the Veterans Preference Act from Civil service employees at the State Department.

The Hays Bill was defeated by the Senate in a joint resolution before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The American Federation of Government Employees, the

American Civil Liberties Union, the veterans of Foreign Wars and this newspaper opposed the bill.

THE KOCZAK CASE

The only foreign service officer who testified was "selected out" Stephen A. Koczak, a former Foreign Service Officer. Mr. Koczak had asked for an appeals procedure, citing his own efforts in vain to obtain confrontation, and cross-examination of his superiors.

Readers of this newspaper will recall that Mr. Koczak alleges his record contains forged, back-dated papers substituted for original pages removed by his superiors and destroyed. He also claims that the then Chief of Mission in Berlin, Ambassador E. Allen Lightner, Jr., had written falsely that Mr. Koczak had read the entire efficiency report when in fact, Mr. Koczak asserts, he had not.

LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I recently submitted to my constituents a nine-part legislative questionnaire dealing with topics of national concern. My office received nearly 20,000 responses. I would like to take a few minutes today to briefly correlate the response from these voters with legislation which has been or is currently under the consideration of this Congress.

VIETNAM

With reference to the Vietnam war, one of the most important issues facing this Nation, 2 out of 3 voters in my district opposed any further escalation of the war effort. Twenty-five percent of those comprising this cross section of opinion sought a political solution to the current conflict. Another 22 percent of the people said that we must maintain our present level of military and diplomatic efforts; 13 percent favored an immediate withdrawal of all U.S. troops and personnel.

In contrast to this group, 33 percent of those polled believed that the United States should declare war on North Vietnam and its allies and then proceed to use all our forces, including nuclear weapons, at our command to win the war. Nine percent did not know or were uncertain of what action should be taken.

GUN CONTROL

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move now to another area, one that has aroused much thoughtful debate amongst my colleagues. This questionnaire was sent to my constituents prior to the assassination of the late Senator Robert Kennedy. Yet the response indicates that there was a general recognition then, of the need for more preventive crime measures. Over half, 54 percent of those polled, said that the interstate sale of firearms should be regulated.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Legislative action on more stringent law-enforcement measures was also strongly supported by the voters. Over half of those polled said that stricter drug abuse laws are required, 46 percent

believed that grants should be allocated to expand and strengthen the local police force and 33 percent said more FBI agents and prosecuting attorneys are needed. While the recent passage of the anticrime bill has strengthened these areas, it is my own conviction that we must continue to legislate new measures which will assist our law-enforcement agencies in their struggle against the growing crime rate.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORMS

A heavy majority of the respondents favored congressional reforms under consideration of the House. A strong code of ethics to be strictly enforced was favored by 64 percent. Nearly half of the voters thought that a full disclosure of all financial assets by Congressmen is desirable. Action which would evoke the retirement of Congressmen and Senators at age 70 and extend the term of office for Representatives from 2 to 4 years was favorably considered by 37 percent of my constituents from the 34th District of California.

TAX INCREASE

While some form of tax increase was deemed necessary by the voters, there was some disagreement over the means of implementing that increase. Thirty-six percent supported a reduction in non-military spending combined with an increase in taxes. A tax increase was advocated by 27 percent. Twenty-one percent of the respondents wanted a 10-percent surcharge.

AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

My constituents expressed a strong concern for the problem of air and water pollution. Sixty-six percent supported legislative action that would seek new means to control, and, if possible, eliminate, the pollution of our skies and waters by unnecessary waste substances. Although the passage of the Oil and Hazardous Substance Pollution Control Act of 1968 and the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1968 are genuine efforts in this direction, I would suggest to my colleagues that this is an area which merits continued research and congressional consideration.

HARD-CORE UNEMPLOYED

I found that in the area of general domestic programs, my constituents were almost evenly divided among those who thought that expenditures on domestic programs should be increased, decreased, or maintained at the present levels. However, there was overwhelming support of programs directed at training the hard-core unemployed, a group today comprising 2 million unemployed and 15 to 20 million underemployed. In response to this concern, I submitted last week, a measure which would enlist the assistance of private industry in the creation of new job opportunities for these hard-core unemployed. The Human Investment Act of 1968 will provide incentives for individuals and business concerns that create both new jobs and job-training opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, I am submitting the results of this questionnaire to the consideration of my colleagues in the hope that the sampling of voter opinion expressed here will assist them in determining

their individual courses of action. I believe that the response to this legislative questionnaire clearly outlines those areas where we must continue seeking new and better legislative measures, to meet the needs of our growing population.

THE CRISIS IN OUR SKIES

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, a little less than a year ago, I warned the Congress, the FAA, and the aviation industry that unless a comprehensive program was undertaken immediately to promote safety and reduce the congestion in our most crowded air corridors and at our principal airports, we would face a crisis of major proportions. In the past 3 months, that prediction has unfortunately been realized.

The air traffic control system and the facilities of airports in major metropolitan areas are saturated during prime hours. La Guardia Airport in New York recently set a single-day record for flight operations and the centers at Chicago and Los Angeles are rapidly approaching a new peak. Delays in takeoff and landing at airports such as La Guardia, Kennedy, Los Angeles, and O'Hare are running from 30 minutes to 3 hours.

There are six basic causes for this dangerous, costly, and aggravating situation:

First, the inability of the FAA and CAB several years ago to anticipate the current boom in aviation and plan accordingly for personnel, facilities, and equipment. The FAA just 2 years ago actually boasted of personnel reductions as an economy move. The shortage of

trained air traffic controllers is now desperate. Our airports and equipment are ages behind meeting current requirements.

Second, the failure of the airlines to voluntarily schedule flights in a manner that would ease congestion. Each airline, in a mad dash for the passenger's dollar and with little regard for his safety or comfort, tries to cram in as many peak-hour flights as possible.

Third, the inability or unwillingness of the Civil Aeronautics Board, in consultation with the FAA, to put an end to this practice and require more dispersed airline scheduling.

Fourth, a deliberate, albeit thoroughly justified campaign by the air traffic controllers for strict adherence to safety regulations with a resulting slowdown in flight operations. Of course, this campaign raises serious questions about the compromises with safety permitted by the controllers heretofore.

Fifth, the reluctance of the FAA to set aircraft capability and pilot proficiency standards for each major airport and air corridor in the Nation, a step I urged 10 months ago. Positive control is now a must in these corridors, yet still is not required. Pilot ratings and aircraft equipment standards must be established to be compatible with corridor and airport control systems, also yet to be accomplished.

And sixth, the inordinate delay in construction of additional airport facilities for both general and carrier use, including new runways at existing airports and provisions of adequate towers, instrument landing systems, and radar equipment.

A number of immediate steps are in order to alleviate the congestion problem:

First, the FAA should be exempted from employment ceilings imposed by the recent tax bill. Congress should ap-

propriate whatever funds may be necessary to fill air traffic control positions and relieve controllers of the 6-day work-week and heavy overtime schedule which has been forced upon them.

Second, The FAA, CAB and Air Transport Association should attempt to work out a voluntary program for spreading out airline schedules. If such a program cannot be achieved voluntarily, the CAB, with specific congressional authority, should impose upon the commercial carriers scheduling requirements that will insure the safety and convenience of the traveling public, not only today, but in the days ahead, when aviation's boom will reach new peaks.

Third, The FAA should immediately restrict the space around major airports, at least during periods of defined congestion, to controlled aircraft. Steps should be taken to set standards for each airport and air corridor.

Fourth, A program of construction of airport facilities and installation of towers, instrument landing systems and radar should be embarked upon to catch up with current requirements.

I think it would be worthwhile, in terms of air safety in the long run, for congressional hearings to be conducted on the role and problems of air traffic controllers. I would be particularly interested in developing a record which will demonstrate conclusively the type of conditions these men work under and their effect on aviation safety. Also, Congress and the Nation should know precisely what liberties were taken with safety regulations before the current "going by the book" campaign went into effect.

There is an urgent necessity for immediate and positive action. Every segment of the aviation industry, every agency of government with jurisdiction over air transportation, must meet its responsibility.

SENATE—Thursday, July 25, 1968

The Senate met at 12 noon, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of grace and God of glory, trusting only in Thy mercy would we seek Thy face. For in Thy mercy there is a wideness like the wideness of the sea. Grant us the grace to keep our hearts with diligence, knowing that out of them are the issues of life.

In these days of tension and crisis, as we gird the might of the Nation, and that of our allies, to defend threatened liberties, may we take care to strengthen the spiritual foundations of our democracy, knowing that without these verities we but build on sinking sand.

Help us to lay aside every weight of prejudice or of selfish pride, and with glad and eager feet to march with the armies that go to free, not to bind, to develop and not to rule, to cooperate and not to dominate, until the knowledge of the Lord, who is no respecter of

persons, shall cover the earth as the waters now cover the sea.

For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 24, 1968, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I understand that there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business up to 12:30 p.m., and that thereafter the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The bill clerk read the nomination of Edward C. Sylvester, Jr., of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.